

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

MUCH is written in our time about religious experience, and great stress is laid upon its objective reality, its validity, and the value of its evidence in support of man's faith in God.

—

This is a healthy reaction from the rationalistic idea that God is simply an object of philosophic study and the Christian faith a complex of doctrines to be drawn out by processes of cold logic.

—

Yet it will be found that religious experience is very vaguely conceived, so that it is not always easy to grasp what is to be understood by it and what its evidence amounts to. In particular it seems often to be identified pre-eminently with certain rare types of intense emotion and exalted feeling characteristic of those who are classed as mystics.

—

Certain objections to this arise at once in the mind of the ordinary man. He is conscious for one thing that though a sincere Christian he enjoys no ecstatic moods, he is not visited by mystic feelings or thrills in his soul which convince him of the immediate presence of God. He may have earnestly sought such experiences, may have tried in times of special religious aspiration to work up such feelings in his soul, and having failed, may have reproached himself for his deadness of heart. On the other hand, he may have learned from the writings of the mystics that the heights of their religious exaltation have often been followed by reactions when they were plunged into the depth

of spiritual misery and even despair. So he may conclude that it is better to abjure the heights and plod along the level road of duty without the heavenly thrills and exquisite agonies of the mystic soul. None the less he would fain have some assurance that his faith is not vain.

—

Then there is always the difficulty of how to interpret the experience. Just as a sick man has pains and symptoms which he can accurately describe yet needs a medical practitioner to interpret them, so is it with religious experience. The man who has the experience is not necessarily the correct or the best interpreter of the experience. William James in his 'Varieties of Religious Experience' gives the story of how a free-thinking French Jew was converted to Roman Catholicism by what he took for a vision of the Virgin Mary. 'Oh, indeed, it was She!' he exclaimed, 'It was indeed She!' One may be sure that if he had been living in a Protestant environment his interpretation of his experience would have been different.

—

The fluctuations of human feeling are so notorious and our spiritual experiences are so varied and perplexing that warnings have to be given by wise religious teachers not to trust in changeful feelings but in the unchanging Word of God. This, however, at once raises the question of how the Word of God is to be recognized as such. The answer which Robertson Smith gave to this question was in harmony with Reformation teaching. 'This

record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul.' That, of course, involves a most definite religious experience.

It is impossible, in short, to put aside religious experience, and the testimony of experience must always have weight. When the man born blind can say, 'One thing I know, that whereas I was blind, now I see,' no argument to the contrary is of any avail. And men do have religious experiences of that sort. They can testify that for them life is a new thing, and the change must be accounted for. When Müller of Bristol found the daily wants of his great orphanage supplied with the most minute and unfailing accuracy through a long course of years an irresistible impression was made on his mind, and on other minds, that a loving heavenly Father was caring for His children in response to their faith and prayer. Many plain Christian folk, without ecstasies and tumults of feeling, have had their faith sustained by experiences of that sort.

The subject of religious experience, then, is of great interest and importance, and it deserves to be studied with the utmost care. A very helpful book in this connexion is *The Validity of Religious Experience*, by the Rev. F. E. ENGLAND, Ph.D., M.A., B.D. (Nicholson & Watson; 8s. 6d. net). One of the excellences of this book is that it treats religious experience psychologically as a genuine branch of human experience whose validity is to be tested in the usual way. 'No subject of human investigation within can long remain the shelter of a sacred enclosure, screened from the scrutiny of logical analysis. Logic does not supply the material of religious experience, but logic determines its validity or shatters its pretensions. Not that our thinking must be tried by static and barren moulds of so-called "formal logic," but rather that our thinking must accord with certain fundamental principles without which knowledge itself would be impossible.'

The writer carries through a long and acute

analysis of the genesis and content of religious experience. He finds that self-consciousness, the power of self-determination, and the sense of moral obligation carry with them certain important implications. 'Progress in personal development depends upon the person's response to a call from outside and above him. Personality lives and grows as it becomes more and more familiar with an order of reality which is gradually disclosed to us in factual situations. . . . We do not invent moral values, we discover them at the heart of our experience. They become articulate in times of moral stress. Whether we conceive of a World of Forms seeking continual ingression in the phenomenal world, or of an Unmoved Mover drawing individuals ever onward towards himself as a lover draws the beloved, the experience of moral individuals is left inexplicable save as it be regarded as the response of the human creature to the challenge of a higher order.'

We conclude with Von Hügel that no account of the religious consciousness will be more than a ludicrous caricature unless it recognizes that from the first, God, the abiding reality on which our mutable being depends, is regarded as *given*, and that the piquancy of the religious life depends precisely on this givenness. Freud followed by many modern psychologists has asserted that religious experience is based on illusion, that the idea of God is a projection of the human mind born out of the stress of man's conflict with Nature and his sense of impotence. But, as against this, one is impelled to ask, what was it that stimulated man to embark upon the apparently hopeless task of shaping his conduct in accordance with standards flagrantly opposed to his natural impulses? 'Let it be granted that man's thought about the spiritual order follows the line of his deepest needs; granted that a man's religious experience is born of a sense of dependence; granted that the religious conceptions held by many people (especially by the sort of people described in Freud's case-histories) are deeply dyed with superstition and infantile fantasy; these facts have little bearing on the question of the objective validity of the religious conception of God.'

The question of objectivity is wrongly approached if we start out to consider whether the idea of God has any sort of counterpart in reality. 'The real problem is not whether this or that conception of God may be admitted to have objective validity, but what concept of God, of the Unconditioned, of the Absolute, of Reality as a whole, of the Supreme Unity or the Supreme Ground of Reality, or whatever other name be used, we are compelled to form if we are to do full justice to all the facts of experience so far as those facts have been discriminated by mortals.' In attempting the solution of this problem we must avoid the fallacy that the rational is the real, in the sense that reality can be deduced with mathematical certainty from our laws of thought. We must be content with that degree of probability which we find sufficient for our guidance in the practical affairs of life. 'How should we explain the emergence of personality with its qualities of self-consciousness, self-determination, knowledge, valuation, and love were it not that these qualities, together with all qualities yet to be actualized in the finite world, subsisted at the heart of reality as a whole?'

In short, our clue to the nature of God must be anthropic, if not anthropomorphic. When we have a sense of moral obligation, of loyalty to inviolate goodness, of adoration in presence of the supremely holy, we are conscious of values outside and beyond ourselves. It is not mere piety which compels us to conceive of the source of these values as an existent Being. For the quality of holiness cannot be divorced from a Holy Being; goodness is an abstraction apart from some personal Embodiment; love and adorableness, if they belong to reality at all, must belong to a Holy Lover. 'Whatever may be the notion to which we are finally driven, we can hardly escape the conviction that behind all finite things and events there is a creative spirit, working ceaselessly with a material which is at once refractory and difficult and yet subject to ultimate control. . . . But the greatest wonder of God's activity is not His presence in the *cursus ordinarius* of Nature but His presence at the heart of human life, converting a spectacle of irremediable suffering into a tragedy in which new and loftier

values come to light. When men called Jesus the Son of God they meant that in Him God was visiting and redeeming His people. They saw the age-long redemptive activity of God made personal in Christ. In the way Christ met the ugly passions of men, they got a glimpse of the patience and holy love of God. And in the face of the crucified Christ men saw the primal creative appetite concretely and sublimely expressed.'

In the 'Spectator' of September 24th, a letter, in which the writer was commenting on Mr. H. G. Wells's utterances about education, contained the following interesting passage: 'After hearing the views of four educational experts from four different nations, Mr. Wells observed very truly that there was no agreement between them on the vital question, What is the Community? In making this remark Mr. Wells exposed one of the major tragedies of our time, and one of the chief causes of our spiritual, intellectual, and moral confusion. . . . Every social and religious and educational doctrine depends finally upon some conception of the Community, which the doctrine in question seeks to establish or consolidate; but what concord can be found between the leading exponents of such doctrines to-day?'

This is exactly the point of *The Beloved Community*, by Canon Roger LLOYD of Winchester (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net). There has always been a tension between the individual and the community, says Canon LLOYD. This tension is the real stuff of which History is made. There is something in man which requires both self-expression and discipline, 'multitude and solitude.' And they war against each other. You find this in every kind of society, from a trade union to an empire. And the success of a society in surviving depends on its ability to reconcile the two sides, the individualism that will take its own way, and the social group that limits and disciplines this waywardness. This effort has been made from time immemorial. It is being made to-day by systems that get down on one side of the fence or the other.

You can only get rid of the tension by some such one-sided process. The Totalitarian State does so by suppressing the individual. Anarchism does so by negating the community. All utopias do so by a dream condition that avoids reality. This is true, for example, of the conventional picture of heaven, where all is smooth and monotonous just because the tension has been abolished. But you cannot abolish this strain in human experience, because it is inevitable and necessary. It is the condition of progress. To try to suppress it is to ask man to cease to be human. The state of tension is a principle of creativeness, and necessary for growth. The interests of the individual and the community have always clashed, and will never cease to clash.

The real problem is to make the tension 'creative and fruitful.' In other words, it is to achieve an adjustment between the needs of the individual and the needs of the society, between the individual's self-expression and the rights and function of the community. What principle can we find that will do justice to both sides? Canon LLOYD finds this principle in religion. It is only when the individual and the community are set within the framework of spiritual reality that they are unified and the tension between them, while it is not destroyed, is made creative of life and fruitful in service. Personal liberty and corporate loyalty are equalized and reconciled in the one state of society in which the dream of such a reconciliation has been realized, the Christian Church.

Canon LLOYD insists on this point with repeated emphasis. We are in the very midst of a world confusion in which attempts are being made to solve the eternal problem, *the* problem of our day in particular, of the relation of personality to society. Democracy, Communism, Authoritarianism are all efforts to find a way of reconciliation. But they all fail, for one thing, because they are temporal and materialistic. The one possible solution is to be found on two conditions. One is a spiritual interpretation of life. Life in and under God. And further, secondly, it is found only in a context of eternal life. Canon LLOYD

insists on this latter point. 'The supreme need of all sociology is the constant recollection of the fact of eternal life.' And if this seems a trifle distant and impractical, Miss Underhill, commenting on it, in an article in 'Time and Tide,' reminds us that 'the wider the horizon within which we are able to place any observed series, the greater our chance of escaping merely utilitarian or self-interested solutions and approximating to the truth.'

At any rate, it is in a spiritual society that Canon LLOYD finds the only real solution of the great problem of our day. And for confirmation he directs us to the Bible. 'The Bible has more light to shed on the problem we are considering than has any other book in the world.' The problem is insoluble apart from religion, because the self-sacrifice and devotion and discipline which are essential to a reconciliation can be secured only by religion, only in 'an experience which has God at its heart.' The fact of God and His relevance both to the community and to the individual are the very characteristics of a community which did rule its life by divine standards, that of ancient Israel and of the New Israel, the Christian Church.

For the Jew the community was life, *and* the individual was profoundly important and significant. Both achievements were his, and to the fact that he maintained them on a fruitful level of tension is to be traced the supreme contribution to history and civilization which the Jews made. And this was so because the Jews were supreme theocrats. No doubt it was community that was specially emphasized in Israel. While the Old Testament is a story of heroes and saints, their significance lay in the fact that all they did was done for Israel. To the Old Testament Jew the nation was the supreme expression of the very being of God. God is incarnate in it. His glory is expressed in it. Everything done is done to promote the welfare of the nation. The great figures in the Old Testament are not so much persons as Jews. They were parts of the community. And the interventions of God were interventions within the community rather than separate inspirations of the leaders.

When we step into the New Testament the emphasis is changed. The individual comes to the front. In the Old Testament, for the most part, the individual is only significant as part of the community. Jesus stresses the worth of the individual soul in its own right. This is so well known it does not need to be enlarged on. But it ought to be noted that this stress on the individual in the teaching of Jesus was due to two things—His belief in personal immortality, and His vision of the service which the redeemed individual could render to the community. But while Jesus emphasized the worth of the individual He did not lose sight of the community. What He did was to universalize it. In the Parable of the Good Samaritan community is shown to rest on acts of kindness which leap over all the artificial barriers that men erect between themselves. And at the Well in conversation with the Samaritan woman He expressed a similar view in regard to worship.

There can be no doubt that Jesus had in view a community, and that in this new fellowship the individual and the community would each have its function. There would never be an absence of tension, because individual and community would each have its rights. Neither factor would be suppressed. But the individual would find his happiness and his welfare and peace in the service of the community. Life and opportunity and blessing would come to him through the community, and the tension that must always exist between the two would be made creative of good and fruitful of service to the world by the fact that both were rooted in God, and the goal of both was the perfect fulfilment of His will in a sphere that is not bounded by time or space but is a realm of eternal life. And so there never will be a solution to the problem that faces us to-day, as it has faced other times, until we base all upon a spiritual interpretation of life, and especially upon a context which is not only spiritual but eternal.

Our wonder grows as to how Dr. TEMPLE finds the mere time to accomplish what he does. The care of the churches in his large and important

Diocese and the superintendence of his Province, his service on so many committees and at so many conferences, the number of public engagements fulfilled, and—what directly concerns us—the production of so many books—how is it done? Well, it is done, and it is well done.

From the Archbishop's pen we welcome another of those smaller books which are finding and edifying that large, not academic, but earnest, public for which they are designed. The most recent is *Basic Convictions* (Hamish Hamilton; 2s. 6d. net). It consists of four short but pregnant chapters on the Reality of God and the Obligation of Worship; the Revelation of God in Jesus Christ; the Cross of Christ and the Need of the World; and the Divine Constraint of Christian Missions—basic topics indeed.

We may serve our readers most profitably if we follow Dr. TEMPLE in just one subject. While all his topics are vital and each is illumined by his treatment, we select that which he handles in the latter portion of his first chapter—Prayer. That, of course, is itself a very big subject, the full treatment of which would take a volume many times the size of this little book. Yet in a few pages Dr. TEMPLE has contrived to set forth several points about prayer some or all of which even people who do pray too frequently forget. And because they forget those things they are not seldom sorely perplexed.

Why should we pray at all? Because we are convinced that God is real—the God and Father whom Christ revealed. One who does not pray does not believe that God is real. Further, we are convinced that we ourselves are poor, needy, and sinful. If we were perfect there would not be the same necessity to pray; but we are far from perfect, and so if we know of God and what kind of God He is, and if we know ourselves, we pray.

But is it of any use to pray? What difference does praying make? Every minister has been confronted with that question, and it is not always easy to answer. Fortunately modern science has considerably relaxed its conception of natural law.

It no longer condemns us to a universe where all things follow in an unmodifiable series of iron necessity. We mean nowadays by the uniformity of Nature no more than regularity, some would say average regularity, of happenings. And in Dr. TEMPLE's words, 'while God behaves regularly at nearly all times, this is not because He is bound so to do, but because it is conducive to His purpose so to do. And if that be true, then, when the occasion is sufficient, He can and will do something contrary to the ordinary course of nature.'

Further, we do not pray in order 'to persuade God to do what He was not going to do before.' 'We do not try to change His mind: that would be an enterprise blasphemous in the attempt and calamitous in the accomplishment.' Prayer for any particular good must always have at the back of it the basal prayer, 'Thy will be done,' 'nevertheless not as I will, but as Thou wilt.'

Forgetfulness of this induces the too often artificial and unreal perplexity as to unanswered prayer. Who has never been perplexed by it? The mother has cried to God for the life of her child, yet the child was taken. Our fairest dreams of good have failed often enough, despite our prayers. We must always remember that 'what we are aiming at in prayer is not changing God's mind but changing our own minds, putting ourselves into such true fellowship with God (which means obedience to Him) that what is truly blessing in its own nature may be effectually a blessing to us.'

Every true prayer, says Dr. TEMPLE, is granted in some form or other. But it is often granted in a form which we do not quite desire. Here he makes a very striking point. If our prayer is for increase in some grace of character, then almost inevitably the answer will consist in giving us fresh and probably harder opportunities for the practice of the desired virtue, 'as in the case of the lady who prayed for patience only to have her prayer answered by being provided with an ill-tempered cook.' We cannot have patience except in the exercise of it; and therefore 'to pray for patience is to ask in effect that your life may be for a little while rather specially irritating.' Which is just the Archbishop's way of saying that among God's manifold mercies is the mercy which denies our own specific request and substitutes something we did not desire, but proves in our experience to be a far, far better thing. 'The truly effective prayer is that offered

by the man who does not primarily care about the difference he makes, but primarily cares about the glory of God.' But we are so constantly tempted to regard prayer as a means of getting our own will done.

Another good point is this. 'The fact that God wants you to attempt something is no ground whatever for supposing that He wants you to succeed at it.' At first this sounds a hard saying, but if we think it over, we shall find that not only is it true, but that there is comfort in it. We are depressed so often at the seeming fruitlessness of our best efforts. What minister has not been flung into the depths of despondency by the lack of visible result? He seems to himself to be beating the air, he wonders if he has not mistaken his vocation. He is wrong in that despondency. God sent him into the vineyard but gave him no guarantee of a soul per sermon, or even a soul a year. 'I may be going to carry out His purpose precisely through my failure, the way I bear it, and the lessons that men learn from it.'

Primitive prayer according to the best authorities was a cry for succour in some specific strait. What is wrong about much of our praying is that we have not outgrown the primitive. Our prayers are overmuch a list of petitions for ourselves or others. Certainly we have authority—the highest—for asking for definite boons, but we should remember on the same highest authority that our Heavenly Father knoweth what we have need of. So Dr. TEMPLE's last point is that the very heart of prayer is not petition but adoration. 'The most effective thing that the Church of Christ can do in the world, and the most effective thing that any individual Christian can do, is to lift up his heart in adoration to God.' We may interject that one great defect of free public prayer is its lack of this element of adoration. We hope that this point of Dr. TEMPLE's will be pondered. 'As we become forgetful of ourselves and entirely filled with His glory—the glory of His righteousness and love, we become transformed into His image from glory to glory; and because we are more like Him, we shall live more like Him; because we live more like Him, we shall do something that is far more truly His will than what we might have planned out for ourselves in an eager and perhaps impatient generosity. Adoration—the utter giving of the self to God that He might fill it, a total forgetfulness of self in the presence of God that God may be all in all—that is the heart of worship.'

Aramaic Gospel=Sources and Form=Criticism.

BY PROFESSOR W. R. TAYLOR, PH.D., D.D., UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

THE translation of the Four Gospels published in 1933 by Professor C. C. Torrey and his recent work, *Our Translated Gospels* (1936), have elicited widely differing opinions with reference to the validity of his main thesis. The views of recent students of the problem may be said to fall into four classes. There is first that of Professor Torrey himself, as it is stated in the introduction to his work, 'the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John were composed in Aramaic on the basis of popular documents widespread in Palestine, and they were by others translated into Greek without intended change; also, Luke employed only Semitic sources, assembling them into an especially complete Gospel, which he himself translated.' Secondly, there is the 'minimal hypothesis,' as Professor T. W. Manson styles it,¹ 'Most scholars would now agree that the authentic pieces of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels and the earliest stories about Jesus were originally formulated in Aramaic whether or not they ever took written shape in that language.' Obviously this view gives considerable latitude to those who hold it, since there can be wide differences of opinion as to what material is authentic and early. But there is a third view which is perhaps more minimal than Professor Manson anticipated. It is stated by Professor D. W. Riddle,² 'When Dr. Torrey's Aramaic gospels are studied in the light of the history of gospel research, it is seen that there is little in his theory that is new. The inexorable logic of history plainly points to the fate of the earlier theories which were so closely similar. It is highly probable that Dr. Torrey's Aramaic gospels will go the way of Eichhorn's and Marshall's, the way of all those theories which have depended upon Semitic documents to solve the Synoptic problem.' In Professor Riddle's article there seems to be a certain confusion of Professor Torrey's theory of the Aramaic sources of the Gospels with his theory of their growth and formation, two interests which ought to be kept distinct. Finally, there are scholars, such as Professor Manson,³ Professor Karl Kundsinn,⁴ and Professor E. Litt-

mann,⁵ who admit evidences of the existence of one or more Aramaic documents behind the Gospels. Professor Manson's conclusions are specific. 'The only case in which one can feel fairly confident that a written Aramaic source lies behind the Gospels is that of the document Q. I think it very probable that such an Aramaic document existed, and that it is the writing referred to in the tradition handed down by Papias. It is also, I think, probable that much of the matter peculiar to Matthew is derived from an Aramaic document or documents. It is at least possible that an Aramaic document is one of the sources of the Fourth Gospel. Mark and the matter peculiar to Luke seem to me to depend on oral tradition rather than written Aramaic sources, though a great part of this oral tradition was doubtless Palestinian and, in the first instance, Aramaic.' Dalman in his studies proceeds cautiously with the basal assumption that the words of Jesus were originally in Aramaic. But, as he establishes no criteria by which we can distinguish between the genuine words of Jesus and those that are of secondary origin, his investigations are practically little different from those which assume the existence of a Semitic source behind the Synoptic Gospels.

In general, the reasons which in recent years influenced scholars to assume the dependence of the Synoptic Gospels and even that of the Fourth Gospel on Aramaic sources, have been set forth by Wellhausen in his *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien* (1905), pp. 14-43. Later investigations and discoveries may have modified some of the details of Wellhausen's argument, but for the most part it defines those things which a student acquainted with Greek and Semitic idioms notes on reading the Gospels. In short, the language in which they are written appears to be a Semitized Greek. The papyri evidences have served to confirm such a conclusion. No document has been found that proves the existence of a jargon which might account for the characteristic features of the language of these books. 4 Maccabees, which belongs to the century in which the Gospels appeared, indicates that what is described as 'truly Greek' was used and understood in Jewish circles. Like the Greek of the

¹ THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvii. 7.

² *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv. 138.

³ THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlvii. 7.

⁴ *Das Urchristentum* (1929), p. 12.

⁵ Z.N.W. xxxiv. 20-34.

LXX, the Greek of the Gospels is written in an idiom which stands apart from that employed in either literary or popular *κοινή*.¹

None knew better than Wellhausen the difficulties that beset the scholar who undertakes to reproduce the Aramaic *Urtext*. The first of them is the lack of Palestinian Aramaic documents of the first century A.D. and the resultant ignorance of the exact idiom of the period. This defect of literary material, however, cannot be cited as invalidating the substance of the theory. It is rather late in the day to say that the scantiness of the remains of this Aramaic indicates that however large the public for spoken Aramaic, 'it was not a public which called forth an extensive written product.'² It is common knowledge that Josephus issued the first draft of his book, the *History of the Jewish War*, in Aramaic for a public which included not only Jews at home, but Parthians, Babylonians, the most remote tribes of Arabia, his countrymen beyond the Euphrates and the inhabitants of Adiabene.³ As Thackeray states,⁴ Josephus was in this matter commissioned by the Romans to write such a history for purposes of propaganda, that is, with a view to discouraging unrest and revolt in Western Asia. Evidently at that time there was a large public for written Aramaic.⁵ The survival of the literature of an age or even of a country is often a matter of accident. For example, if we learn of the Seleucids chiefly through the scanty evidences that coins afford and of the Ptolemies through a wealth of *papyri*-remains, we cannot conclude that the Seleucid kingdom had no public for literature. In fact, such caprices of fortune may lead to a distorted view of the historical conditions in such matters. It was to guard against such misconceptions of the place of Aramaic in Palestine in the first century that Dalman in the second edition of *Die Worte Jesu* (1930), pp. 1-10, reviews the evidences presented earlier in his *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch* (1905). These evidences might have been supplemented by those indirect ones offered by the Nabataean inscriptions of the first century A.D. and by the structural features of Aramaic that, wherever in the East its remains

emerge, exhibit the marks of literary use and tradition. We can posit too that an Aramaic-speaking public normally would call forth a written product.⁶

Nor is there much cogency in the argument that because theories of Semitic gospels or gospel sources have in the course of more than one hundred years failed to present an incontrovertible case, the problems that occasioned them must be dismissed as illusory. Such theories were at a disadvantage not only by reason of the prejudices born of the age-long conviction that the Gospels in Greek were primary documents, but also through the lack of philological knowledge equal to the task involved.⁷ But the amoeboid character of Synoptic theories which have won more general acceptance warns us that the last word on Gospel-origins has not been said, and the persistence with which theories of Semitic sources reappear suggests that the facts which bring them into being have not been satisfactorily integrated into the current orthodox theories.

Nor does it seem more cogent to refer Aramaic elements in the Gospels to the influence of spoken Aramaic in the form of Christian preaching on the early records. If the Aramaic elements consisted only of social background, atmosphere, cult-terminology, and related matters such a position might be tenable. But, as things are, it fails to take account of the literary problems presented in the text of the Gospels. Among these may be noted (a) differences in parallel synoptic traditions due to a misunderstanding or corruption of a written source which we are warranted in believing to be Aramaic—e.g. Mt 23²⁶ preserves correctly the meaning of Lk 11⁴¹ where an original 'abedu šaddiqā ('make right') was mistaken for 'abedu šedāqā or šidqā ('give alms'),⁸—(b) obscure elements in the Synoptic tradition which become intelligible through the assumption of an Aramaic source—e.g. Mk 7³ the difficult *πυγμή* is the result of the confusion of the Aramaic *ligmar* ('at all') with *ligmod* (= *πυγμή*),⁹ so that the original source read 'they do not eat at all unless,' etc.: Lk 11⁴⁸ where the awkward lack of an object after *οικοδομεῖτε* is to be explained as due to a confusion of *benin* ('children') with *bānēn* ('build'), i.e. 'they killed them and you are their children'—(c) strange idioms, such as the arrangement of

¹ Cf. H. St. J. Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek* (1909), pp. 26 f.; C. C. Torrey, *The Four Gospels* (1933), p. 249.

² *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv. 136.

³ *Bellum Judaicum*, i. 6.

⁴ Thackeray, *Josephus* (1929), p. 27.

⁵ Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik* (1925), p. 17.

⁶ *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv. 136.

⁷ Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 49 f.

⁸ Torrey, *op. cit.* 310; see also Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 372.

⁹ Torrey, *op. cit.* 300.

words in an order foreign to Greek with consequent confusion in the sense—for example, Mt 5³⁷ the Aramaic word-order is difficult in Greek; a better rendering is given in Ja 5¹². The translation of the verse is 'Let your word "yes" be yes and your "no" be no; whatever goes beyond this is of the evil one'.¹—(d) the puzzling use of particles and cases—e.g. the preposition *eis* to introduce a direct object, *ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα* (Lk 21⁴); the dative case of a direct object, *Ἰωαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυὶδ* (Mt 21⁹). Both instances, however, are intelligible as Aramaic constructions with the preposition *l*. In Mk 9¹⁰ the interrogative particle translated traditionally, and even by Torrey, as 'what' is, as the context indicates, to be turned as 'how' or 'after what manner,' a common value of the Hebrew *ḥ* and the Aramaic *ḥ* as we see in Nu 23⁸ (LXX) where *τί ἀράσωμαι* = *ḥ* *ḥ* *ḥ* ('how shall I curse'). Another instructive example is supplied by the text of the Golden Rule, Mt 7¹² *πάντα οὖν ὅσα εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐλάλησεν . . .*, Lk 6³¹ *καὶ καθὼς θέλετε . . .* In the Matthean text *πάντα* is probably not to be explained as an example of Matthew's introduction of *πᾶς* in order to heighten his effects, as Professor Manson believes,² but rather as a too literal translation of the *ḥ* in the Aramaic (ܡܢ) *ܡܢ ܕܡܢ*. In LXX *ܡܢ ܕܡܢ* is translated *καθότι* (Dn 2⁸), *καθὼς* (Dn 2⁴⁰ 6¹⁰), *καθάπερ* (Dn 2¹⁰ 4¹). Matthew and Luke therefore have a common text before them, but exhibit differences in skill in the rendition of it. Such citations are sufficient to indicate that in the Greek text of the Synoptic Gospels there are certain problems for which the assumption of an Aramaic *Urtext* affords a reasonable solution.

One might pass beyond such textual phenomena where the argument seems to be irrefutable, and consider certain instances where the evidences, if not at once so decisive, cumulatively tend to establish the theory. For example, it is probable that Professor Torrey's emendation of 'in that day' (Lk 10¹²) by 'in the day of judgement' correctly assumes a mistaken reading of *b'yōm dīnā* as *b'yōmā denā*. The use of the numeral *ḥ*, 'one,' followed by another numeral expresses in Aramaic a multiplicative (cf. Dn 3¹⁸ *ܡܢ ܡܢ*); in Mk 4⁸ 20, therefore, the difficult *εἰς* and *ἐν* about which the textual evidences are uncertain should read *εἰς* and *ἐν*. The syntax of certain relative clauses exhibits the Semitic idiom of the redundant antecedent incorporated into the clause, or, in other

words, of the retrospective pronoun familiar to students of Hebrew Grammar, e.g. Mk 7²⁵ *ἦς ἐχὲν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς . . .*, Mk 13¹⁹ *οἷα . . . τοιαύτη*. Of such constructions even Moulton³ says: 'The N.T. examples are all from places where Aramaic sources are certainly suspected.' The use of the genitive absolute when in fact the noun or pronoun is not properly absolute and the particle might have agreed with the word in question is more common apparently in the New Testament than in the papyri.⁴ One can scarcely escape the recognition of the idiom in *ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος . . . ἐφάνη αὐτῷ* (Mt 12²⁰).⁵ To satisfy those who contend that support for the Aramaisms of the Gospels should be found in Daniel one may compare the frequent use in Daniel of *ܡܢ ܕܡܢ* to introduce a new moment in a narrative with the similar use of *τότε*, *ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ* and *εὐθύς* (= *ܡܢ ܕܡܢ*) in the Gospel-narrative. The common Semitic practice of putting a compound subject in *casus pendens* is illustrated in Mt 6³, Mk 12⁴⁰; cf. 2 Ch 7²¹ (LXX). The fact that such constructions and circumlocutions as we have been citing are idiomatic in Aramaic weakens considerably the force of parallels that occur sporadically in Greek poetry or prose.⁶

The general case that may be presented for the Aramaic origin of the Gospels ought not to be under-rated because of certain arguments that have been advanced against it. For instance, the difficulty of making assured *retroversions* does not modify in any fundamental respect the significance for the theory of the textual phenomena out of which it arises. It is generally accepted that 1 Maccabees is a translation of a Hebrew text, but the great diversity that 'retroversions' might show has never weighed against the conclusion which appears obvious to students of Hebrew. In Old Testament criticism with both the LXX and the Hebrew text before us, the problem of *retroversions* with which we are regularly confronted emerges without prejudice to the relation between the two texts.

Nor is the deficiency of extant Palestinian Aramaic literature contemporary with the Gospels an insuperable barrier to some secure judgments on the relation of the Gospels to Aramaic sources. The Aramaic language had developed before the

³ J. H. Moulton, *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (1906), p. 95.

⁴ A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (1914), p. 514.

⁵ Cf. Mt 18²⁸, Mk 5²¹ 10¹⁷ 11²⁷ 13¹ 21¹¹ 22¹³.

⁶ Radermacher, *op. cit.* 21; cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*

¹ Cf. Dalman, *op. cit.* 186, 352.

² THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlviii. 8.

time of Jesus certain characteristics which it retained quite tenaciously throughout its long history and its extensive domain. As other languages, it is marked by its own genius or soul. Hence its idiom is easily recognized whenever fragments of its literature come to light, and there is no ground for doubting that it can be detected in translation-works which do not conform completely to another idiom. But such a statement does not imply that more is to be expected in the reproduction of the original Aramaic form of the Gospels than, for example, in the reproduction of a lost Hebrew text from a Greek translation. Even if students were satisfied that the Greek text of Ecclesiasticus was a translation-work, the discovery of the Hebrew text furnished them with something new and beyond their power to anticipate correctly. The latter fact, however, did not impair their earlier assumption. It will be apparent, then, that the faithful identification of the Aramaic antecedents of the text of the Gospels must often wait on fuller knowledge of the local or dialectal usages in the first century in Palestine.

Two phases of the problem need at this time some special attention, (a) whether the evidences of Aramaic can be found beyond the limits of Q which a growing number of students concede to be a translation, and (b) what relation does the presence or absence of such evidences bear to the 'Sitz im Leben' problems of Form-criticism. These questions can be examined together since certain texts have reference to both. Since Lk 13¹⁻⁵, 6-9, 31-33 is not a portion of Q and is illustrative of three types of *apophthegmata* which the *Formgeschichtlicher* recognize, it can serve as a suitable section for examination. Lk 13¹⁻⁵ seems in form to accord with Bultmann's description of the Greek apophthegm,¹ and might on this ground be viewed as a product of an Hellenistic environment and therefore of a relatively late date. Bultmann, however, because of its subject-matter seems to regard it as Palestinian in origin.² At any rate, according to Klostermann,³ it is not to be included among the genuine *logia*, and reflects the legend-making tendencies of the Early Church. But early or late, Hellenistic or Palestinian, this text exhibits the same marks of Aramaic origin which have been noted in passages from Q. The Lucan *ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ* renders *בְּהַשְׁמָתָא* (cf. Dn 3⁶, 15⁴⁰

5⁵). In addition to the use of the retrospective pronoun (*αὐτῶν* v.¹, *αὐτοῦς* v.⁴), the nominative absolute (*ἐκείνοι* v.⁴), and the idiomatic *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν* (cf. *מַרְיָא עֲנָה*, Dn 2⁵, 8, 27), there is the use of *πάντας* in the sense not uncommon to *כָּל* of 'the rest,' i.e. *παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους* = 'more than the rest of the Galilaeans.' In Lk 13⁶⁻⁹ there are at least three characteristic Aramaic idioms, (a) *ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ* (v.⁷), i.e. *אֲרַי שְׁנַי תַּלְתָּ מִיְּדֵי* = 'since for three years now,' the particle *מִיְּדֵי* being, as the context suggests, causal rather than temporal; ⁴ (b) the suppression of the apodosis in v.⁹, 'zwar auch griechisch—aber im Semitischen regelmässig' ⁵ (cf. Dn 3¹⁵); (c) *εἰς τὸ μέλλον* which, as Torrey has noted, renders *מֵעַתָּה* = 'thenceforth,' the *ἐ* having a value here similar to that in *עַלְמָא* and such forms. In Lk 13³¹⁻³³ there is not only the phrase *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ*, to which we have already referred, but the obscurity in the sense of vv.^{32, 33} disappears only when (a) *τελειοῦμαι* is recognized as an error due to a translator's confusion of *מְשַׁלֵּם*, i.e. about to be perfected, and *מְשַׁלֵּם*, i.e. about to be delivered up or arrested, and (b) after *αὐριον* (v.³³) there is read *ποιῆσαι* (= *מַעֲבֵר*),⁶ which had been omitted in the Aramaic text because of its resemblance to *מַעֲבֵר* (= *πορεύεσθαι*). Such evidences indicate that the influences of Aramaic are to be traced clearly in material outside of Q and also in traditions that according to the current canons of criticism cannot be early.⁷

Bultmann's statement that it is improbable that Lk 2^{31ff.} and the other infancy narratives took form in a Palestinian community, but that their formation occurred in a more advanced stage of Christianity than that in Palestine⁸ is much too sweeping. Paul Humbert—in a recent study of Biblical annunciations⁹—has easily demonstrated that they are all of one type (cf. Jg 13^{3ff.}, 13⁷, Gn 16^{11ff.}, Is 7^{14ff.}, Lk 1^{31ff.}), and the *Sitz im Leben* is the stereotyped form followed in the consultation of the oracle on the part of childless women. Undoubtedly the difficulty of sustaining his position has led Bultmann to modify it significantly by

⁴ Cf. Marti, *Biblisch-Aramaische Grammatik*, 109.

⁵ Klostermann, *op. cit.* 310.

⁶ 'I must do my work to-day and to-morrow, and on the third day go on my way' (i.e. *die*); cf. Torrey, *op. cit.* 310.

⁷ Cf. a similar highly emotional narrative Gn 49¹⁻¹⁰; contrast the Greek ideal expression of such emotions, *Iliad*, ix. 488-500.

⁸ *Op. cit.* 329 f.

⁹ *Archiv für Orientforschung*, x. (1935), pp. 77-80.

¹ R. Bultmann, *Die Erforschung der Synoptischen Evangelien* (1925), pp. 21-23.

² *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition* (1931), p.

57.

³ *Das Lukas Evangelium* (Handbuch zum N.T.), 142.

the concession that there were different strata in Hellenistic Christianity of which one was Jewish-Hellenistic—a quantity still dimly recognized, as he admits.

A review of such facts, as we have sought to bring forward, must lead to the conclusion that the progressive changes within the Early Christian Church which the *Formgeschichtlicher* stress must have taken place within an Aramaic-speaking and writing community. In whatever part of Syria or Palestine we place it, the evidences show that it was Palestinian in background.¹ Theories

¹ Kundsins, *op. cit.* 37; see also C. H. Dodd, *The Gospel Parables*, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xvi. No. 2 (1932).

which do not take account of Aramaic Gospels, it would seem, must be readapted to the evidences or abandoned. If it be held by some that the Gospels reflect a situation that is foreign to a Palestinian environment since they are influenced by the doctrine of a miraculously born *savior-lord* who imported to his followers a secret *gnosis* and instituted a sacramental meal therewith, and if it be deduced that, since such things are inconsistent with Aramaic documents,² there could have been no such documents, then it must be answered that whether such premisses be right or wrong, the conclusion is invalidated by the strength of the philological arguments against it.

² Riddle, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, liv. 135.

Christianity in Action.

The Christian Faith and Freedom.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID CAIRNS, B.A., BRIDGE OF ALLAN.

A FEW years ago men would have laughed at the suggestion that in the near future Christians would have again to undergo such persecutions as their spiritual ancestors suffered because they refused to put a pinch of incense on the Roman imperial altars. But to-day events in various totalitarian countries have reminded us sharply that the day of idolatry is not yet over—a fact which we should never have forgotten. In Japan, in some places, school-pupils are compelled to be present at rites in Shinto shrines where prayers are made to the divine ancestors of the nation; and the policy of Soviet Russia in dealing with Christian institutions is not more significant than the hostility of the German Government to the Confessional Church, the reconciliation of Hitler with Ludendorff, and the State encouragement given to the mystical ideas of Rosenberg. The problem 'Christ or Cæsar' has once more become a vital issue.

The aim of this article is to maintain that idolatry always results in the destruction of freedom, and that only where there is a background of Christian ideas in a community can there be full security of freedom for its members, irrespective of their religious beliefs. The cynic will point out that often the Christian Church has itself led the way in persecution. This must be conceded, for the Church has often too little understood the implications of its own faith. That faith, rightly understood, is nevertheless the only true buttress of

social and political freedom. If this assertion be true, the wide importance of the Conference of the Churches held at Oxford in July will be seen. Here the Life and Work Œcumenical Movement was dealing not merely with private concerns which are of interest only to the minority who are actively concerned with the work of the Christian Church. The truth is that here rather the human rights of every man and the rights of the different forms of voluntary association were being buttressed against the spring-tides of State absolutism, State idolatry. Karl Barth is right when he says, 'Theology and the Church are the natural frontiers of everything, even of the totalitarian State.' Who would have thought, a few years ago, that the imposing structure of Trade Unionism and Socialism in Germany would have collapsed so quickly before the onslaught of Nazism, while the numerically insignificant and divided Protestant Church would weather the storm?

How is it that the Christian conception of freedom is the only foundation on which political and social freedom can be securely built up? To understand this we must consider shortly the Christian doctrine of man. According to Christian belief two main things can be said about man. Firstly, God created man for communion with Himself. Therefore in each person there is a centre of infinite value. Secondly, All men are sinful. Something has gone wrong. Whatever our ideas about the

Fall, all Christians are agreed on this fact, that man is prone to use his freedom in a wrong way. He seeks self-expression at the expense of others. He does not respect their freedom, their Godward relation, as he ought to.

Now from this first principle of the Christian Doctrine of man we can deduce the moral obligation to give men external freedom. Without a certain freedom from external hindrance—freedom to do right or wrong—no man can attain to that higher freedom, which Luther has called the Freedom of a Christian Man—the freedom to love and obey God with all one's will. To will the good is the chief end of man, but before he can do this, he must be free simply to will effectively.

But since men are sinful, there is a constant temptation to misuse this freedom and to injure the freedom of others. Hence Christian doctrine holds that there must be restrictions on freedom. There must be things that no man is allowed to do. And to keep men from abusing freedom, there must be sanctions of force—such as the State possesses. Here is the Christian justification of the force of the State with reference to its citizens. Behind the law there stands the police force, behind the police are the troops. It is true that often we obey the law because we feel that we ought to, but no one with a sense for political realities would remove all the sanctions of the law, or maintain that those who break it do so out of ignorance and in innocence. The sanction of force behind the law is necessary, and is due to the fact of sin.

Let us examine certain political movements, with a view to showing how they ignore these two principles. The laissez-faire school of liberalism never suggested that the sanctions of the law should be altogether abrogated, but it did allow far too much liberty in economic affairs to the exploiter. Thus doing, it forgot the second principle of the Christian doctrine of man. The result was that the economically powerful class so misused its liberty as to destroy the liberty of the employed. The laissez-faire school believed that by some pre-concerted harmony in the universe unlicensed greed and self-seeking would turn out to the universal advantage. The Bible, however, teaches that the wages of sin is death. By its neglect of the limitations of freedom the laissez-faire school showed itself unrealistic also in its conception of the positive principle of liberty. This was an ideal that had come to laissez-faire liberalism by devious ways from the first tenet of the Christian doctrine of man—the faith that man was created in God's image. In giving a few men unbridled liberty

this type of liberalism made liberty itself something like a mockery, thus giving some justification to the Socialist taunt, 'What use is the vote to a wage-slave?'

We have just been passing through a time when liberalism was in the dock, and it was fashionable to rail at it as an effete faith. It has been too easy to revile it, and to forget that there is a true Christian liberalism which is very different from the laissez-faire type. In this second sense of the word liberalism is not so much the expression of a political faith as the belief that every man must have a certain and limited freedom granted to him. This liberalism it is which says to the State and the other organizations which are potential tyrants over the individual—'Thus far and no farther.' This liberalism is an essential expression of Christianity, whether it happen to be the conviction of a professing Christian, agnostic, or atheist. This liberalism we must never let go, it is one of our most treasured possessions. With it goes that freedom which is the right of humanity as such, and this liberalism is itself really based on the two tenets of the Christian doctrine of man, however confusedly these may be understood.

Like laissez-faire liberalism, Fascism and Communism, however different in many aspects, neglect both these two tenets of the Christian doctrine of man. Communism is the clearest offender in this, but only because its political philosophy is more clearly thought out than are the philosophical systems of the Fascists and Nazis. Communism holds that all the actions which appear to be the result of sin are really the result of the class-system, and that when this is destroyed there will be no more sin. A millennium is coming, in which no sanction of force will be necessary, because the Communist lambs will lie down together, there being Capitalist lions left. Every one will willingly obey Communist doctrine down to the smallest detail. Similarly, though less clearly, there is an unjustified optimism about human nature in Fascism and Nazism. How else could they repose all their confidence in any human principle, such as race, or nation, or State? For these are their Messiahs and Redeemers. For, after all, whatever be the governing principle in a totalitarian State, it is merely human nature in one of its traits, or constituent principles, in which all confidence is placed.

The Communist and Fascist neglect of the first principle of the Christian doctrine of man is too obvious to need more than mention. The philosophies which glory in the suppression of freedom have forgotten that man was created free by God

for communion with Himself. Thus we come to the conclusion that only if we hold fast to the two Christian beliefs about man, can we find a true solid basis for freedom. The failure of the totalitarian States to take account of sin is natural, for without freedom there cannot be sin. Neglect both, and you have not persons, but things. Only a person can sin, a thing is determined by its environment.

Here it is necessary to enter a caveat. Christians do not all live in agreement with Christian belief. Unfortunately many of them have been persecutors, or have failed to see their duty to secure for their employees that freedom which all men should have. And in many respects the Communists have acted in a more Christ-like way than the Christians. Christians have spoken love, but their actions have sometimes spelt hate, while in some cases Communist actions have spelt love, while their theory was one of hate. But that does not alter the fact that they have no philosophical justification for these actions, and a man's actions tend to sink to the level that is justified by his theory.

If we have demonstrated in the preceding part of this article that the Christian faith gives a secure basis for freedom, let us in the latter part examine the nature of idolatry, and see how it necessarily results in the destruction of freedom. Those who believe in God will perhaps be agreed in maintaining that all life has, as it were, a triangular structure. I have a relation to God, and also a relation to my neighbour, while my neighbour has not only a relation to me but also an independent relation to God. In nothing that I do or am, can I be regarded as isolated from the other two corners of the triangle—God, and my neighbour. Out of these relations I cannot escape without ceasing altogether to be human. Every man, even the atheist, has this connexion with God; he can no more escape it by ignoring it than we can escape an obligation by ignoring it. His atheism may be in part the fault of others—a false idea of God may have been given to him, so that he fails to recognize as divine the origin of the communications which God sends to him, and the relations into which God seeks to enter with him.

If a man's relation to God were perfect, his will would accept wholeheartedly God's will for the world—redemption for himself and for his neighbour. Therefore his relationship to his neighbour would be one of complete redemptive love and respect for personality. In so far as a man does not love his neighbour and love and obey God, his relationship does not return along the line to God,

but along another line to a false apex. This apex represents the man's idol for the time being, an idol which he creates. Every false relationship to my neighbour implies an idol, and every idol implies a false relationship to my neighbour.

Let us trace out more closely the connexion here. If I am in a false relationship to my neighbour, I am not in the relationship to God that God desires for me. I am obeying some other command than God's voice. Some desire or aim chosen by me gives me direction. That is my idol for the time being. And when I create an idol, it is in the image of myself or some aspect of my own nature, or some power in myself. I use this to dominate my neighbour. The will to power over my neighbour by means of such idols is not necessarily conscious. But if I worship an idol, I either do not know the God who created my neighbour, or am ignoring the true God. So I also forget the side of the triangle which connects my neighbour with God, if I may so put it, his private wire to God. And it is this which constitutes his true humanity. He then easily falls a prey to the domination and tyranny which my idol exercises on all that fall within its kingdom.

But this tendency to dominate others is not the final stage of idolatry. For our personality only finds its true expression in obedience to God and love to men. Hence any erection of an idol can only result in the domination of ourselves by that which is the caricature of ourselves, a part of our nature torn from its true context and exalted at the expense of all the rest of our nature, our personality. Such an idol becomes an idol that terrifies us, a cancerous growth drawing its life from our dissolution. A man who has made sensuality his idol has exalted one side of his nature which under God's guidance might have found its true expression. But now he is become himself its slave, and this one side of his nature, projected on the background of infinity, enslaves him and becomes his master, as well as dominating others. The man who seeks autonomy, in the sense of independence from God's rule, becomes in the end a slave himself, the slave of fragments of his own nature, which he has invested with the power of the Absolute. The technician may become, for example, the slave of the machine, a horrible and inhuman slavery, if he regards technical efficiency as an end, and not as a means, and forgets that man has only one true end, to glorify God and enjoy him for ever. Technical efficiency in life may and should be a means to this.

The danger for the State from the Christian point of view is that it may become the victim of

such an idolatrous idea—a kind of demon possession. For example, the idea of the Aryan race and its tradition may so dominate a certain European nation that it becomes in time practically a stud-farm, and its citizens are no longer treated as persons, with rights of their own, but become merely links in a chain of pure-bred Aryans. And of all the groups into which the community is divided, the State is the most dangerous if it once becomes thus idol-possessed, because of the sanctions of force which it rightly holds, and may use to enforce its idolatrous ideas.

Let us now proceed to a short diagnosis of the present situation. There are two characteristics of this situation which call especially for notice. The first is the very great complexity of our civilization which has become like a very finely adjusted machine or sensitive organism, which can be very easily thrown out of gear. The lower animals can survive with a primitive nervous organization, but a surgeon who is to perform a delicate operation must have a nervous system which can help him to work quickly, exactly, and decisively. Our present civilization, if ruin is to be averted, must be much more delicately adjusted than were the civilizations of the past. Lack of organization and the incoherence caused by each individual seeking his own interests, will no longer do in the modern world.

Beside this increase in complexity and sensitiveness we must set the fact that there is no longer in the modern world the psychological unity that there was. Ways of living and thinking are different more and more, and one can no longer count on the existence of one religious background which will influence the thoughts and actions of the great majority of men.

The result is that disorganization is much more of a danger than ever before, and if disorganization comes, then governments are discredited, there is unemployment, starvation, and danger of revolution. The inevitable result of this need for greater efficiency and organization is that more and more functions in the community which were once left to individual enterprise are taken over by the State, and the area in which individual liberty rules becomes ever more and more restricted. This is itself inevitable, and is, from an ethical point of view neither to be praised or blamed. If we are to live at all in the modern world we must be organized.

But the danger lies in this fact, that in order to combat the increasing lack of unity in each people, various governments are now trying to bring their various peoples into line by setting up the tyranny

of a State idol, or religion. Citizens in different nations of the world are being dragooned into support of the State worship with cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer. And, as the idols are rivals, the confusion becomes greater, and the pressure on the individuals for moral conscription becomes greater. Beyond the necessary increase in State control and organization there has entered in a pathological element, an idolatry which dominates and terrorizes.

It is interesting to conjecture in what illegitimate ways the State may attempt to infringe the liberty of the individual even in those countries like our own, where, happily, the totalitarian claim has not yet been made. We can get some inkling of what might happen from looking at the case of other countries. The freedom of the press may be assaulted. Here we must distinguish between a legitimate censorship of the press and an illegitimate one. Where does one draw the line between fair criticism of a leader in a foreign country, and unfair personal attacks on such a person, and insults which the Government ought to punish by fine or imprisonment? Who is to secure the impartiality of the judge, who will watch over the watchman?

Then we must also watch vigilantly over the freedom of education. Children in school and students in the universities must never be treated by their teachers as the potter treats the clay. To do this would be more than to usurp God's place, for God never treats man merely as a thing, but always as a reasonable person. There are more kinds of compulsion than the physical, and some of them may be unconsciously exercised by the teacher. Mr. Kurt Hahn, headmaster of the new Public School at Gordonstown, tells a story of the visit of the parents of two pupils to the school. Both expressed their satisfaction with the change that the school was making in their boys, but the first complained to Mr. Hahn that he was making his boy a revolutionary Socialist, while the second asked, 'Why have you made my boy a Fascist?' Mr. Hahn gave them no direct answer, but introduced them to one another, and left them to talk it out. That is liberalism in the finest sense, liberalism which expresses the spirit of Christianity. Such a refusal to mould the character and views of another does not mean that no one has a right to influence another, it merely means that we should take care to use such methods as respect the personality of our neighbour.

Then there is the whole problem of the social activity of the Church. Many functions that once belonged to the Church now belong to the State,

and it is not wrong that this should be so, but we see the danger in secularization of such functions in Russia, where the Church is not allowed to do anything save to hold services of worship. In Germany the same State tyranny is expressed by the fact that all youth organizations save the Hitler Youth Movement have been suppressed. This is fatal, for if Christianity is to be real at all, it must find expression outside the Church doors. It is an essential that the Church should be independent of the State in all matters pertaining to Christ's Kingdom. Luther made the mistake of saying that the Church was independent in spiritual matters, but in material affairs she might receive her stipend and direction from the State. This is an unreal distinction. For if the State has control over the property of the Church, then the State can control the Church's policy by threatening to withhold supplies. If we are in favour of the nationalization of all wealth, we should realize that such control would cut away all liberty, not only from the Church, but also from all other forms of association, which within their own legitimate territories ought to be free from State dictation. The Universities should have a measure of freedom—or else the danger may arise, that when the State becomes totalitarian, the Professors will only be allowed to teach certain doctrines, as in Germany and Russia to-day.

But, it may be objected, are these not all outside questions? Is it likely that this country of freedom would ever be subjected to a tyranny of that kind? The answer to such an objection is not merely that the cause of freedom is an international cause, and that we must not be so insular in our outlook as only to care for liberty within our own shores. We must also realize the uncertainty of political conditions even in our own land. Supposing that unemployment were to continue, or to increase during the next ten years, is there any one who could guarantee that Communism would not become a much more formidable force in Britain than it is to-day? Or if the unstable equilibrium of Europe were to break down, is it not probable that in the ensuing confusion the economic conditions of this country would change very much for the worse? And if that be so, who can guarantee that a great expansion of Communism would not result, for its real roots in the modern world are in the hunger of the people.

But if Communism increases, who can suppose that the propertied classes will go down without a great struggle? And what is more likely than that they will organize themselves in what has shown

itself to be a highly efficient form of organization, under a Fascist dictatorship, probably in forms more congenial to the genius of our people than the German or Italian forms. In either case, if Communism or Fascism were to triumph, the first victim would be the liberty which is the right of every human being. It is therefore high time that we were looking into the very foundations of our freedom, and maintaining a watch lest they be fatally undermined.

It has been the argument of this article that the real foundations of that freedom lie in the Christian gospel, which teaches that man was made by God for communion with Him, and that forgiveness for sin and new life are given through Christ. What are we Christians to do in the face of these threats to freedom? Our first task is the proclamation of the gospel—one might almost say our task is to make the gospel available to the modern world. For there is a temptation to equate the proclamation of the gospel with the preaching of the Word in our half-filled churches. This is necessary, but it does not exhaust our duty. Henry Drummond used to say, 'Either the gospel has lost its power, or it is not being made available. I am convinced that it has not lost its power.' The conclusion that he drew was that the Christian Church, that Christian men and women, were failing in their duty. We of the Church are in danger of failing to recognize the stupendous task that lies before the Church, before us. To-day the message of the gospel is turned aside by millions as a mere irrelevancy. That indifference is in large measure the fault of the Church. The first task is therefore the proclamation of the gospel by means of preaching, personal witness, service, writing. Compared with this other tasks are secondary, other defence of liberty is like playing a hose on a house which is already blazing. For Christianity is the alternative to idolatrous systems which suppress freedom, and we must not only say this but believe it with all the passion of which we are capable, and work for its propagation with a zeal equal to that of the Communist missionaries.

But there is another thing which we must do. There are others who do not profess the Christian Faith, who have yet a conviction of the sanctity of human personality, and with them we must make common cause against the idolaters, even though we may not agree with our allies on every point. And in the last place, the test of persecution may come to us, as it has come in other lands in Europe and Asia. And if it does, we must be willing to suffer for the truth.

Literature.

JESUS AND HIS SACRIFICE.

DR. VINCENT TAYLOR'S work on the historical and literary criticism of the Gospels has rightly earned for him a high place among the New Testament scholars of our day. The latest volume from his pen—*Jesus and His Sacrifice* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net)—will not only enhance his reputation in a sphere which he has made his own but will reveal his capacity to apply the results of critical research to the interpretation of Christian doctrine. Here he appears in the rôle of 'New Testament critic cum theologian'; and we hope that his courageous endeavour will serve to deliver the critical study of Christian sources from the suspicion that it is but remotely related to the 'things that matter most.' Certainly, it will provoke a renewed interest in the doctrine of the Atonement and lead, in the case of many readers, to a fresh orientation of thought and worship.

The theme of the book may be simply stated. Dr. Taylor is convinced that if we are to come to a right understanding of the significance of the Cross, the attitude of Jesus Himself towards it must be closely studied. In the first part of the work, the Old Testament background is reviewed, and careful consideration is given to the following conceptions: Kingdom of God, the Messianic Hope, the Son of Man, the Son, the Servant of Yahweh, and Sacrifice. If, the writer contends, Jesus interpreted the doctrine of the Son of Man in the light of Isaiah 53, we may envisage the possibility that He regarded His own suffering as a sacrificial offering in which men might participate. Dr. Taylor recognizes the difficulties that beset any treatment of the conception of sacrifice, but does not hesitate to affirm his belief that implicit in sacrificial worship is the idea of a life offered to God with which the worshipper may associate himself through appropriate ritual acts. The extent to which this idea was present to the mind of Jesus can only be discerned by an examination of His sayings, and this task is undertaken in the second part of the work. A most illuminating survey is made of the Passion sayings in the Gospels together with the sayings in the Pauline narrative of the Last Supper. The former are, for sufficiently good reasons, studied in the order in which they appear in the sources, and the section as a whole is arranged as follows: (1) the Markan sayings; (2) the sayings in the L tradition; (3) the sayings in 1 Co 11²³⁻²⁵; (4) the Johannine

sayings. In the third and final division of his theme the author draws out the implications of the Passion sayings. He considers that they presuppose that Jesus believed that His Passion was in accordance with the will of God and intimately related to the Divine Rule; that it was an integral element in His Messianic vocation; that it was representative and vicarious; and that men are permitted to enter, in some measure, into His redemptive service. In order that men might share in the power of the life that was surrendered to the will of the Father and participate in its sacrificial ministry, Jesus provided the rite of the Last Supper. (It is obvious to the reader that the Eucharist is central to the mind of the author.) The theological position to which the results of the foregoing inquiries lead is succinctly stated in the final chapter. The Abelardian theory is rejected, partly because it lacks an adequate basis in the Gospels, partly because it fails to answer the question, 'How can a man repent?' We are reminded that a theology of the Atonement must rest upon the data of Gospel history and tradition, and be interpreted in the light of the thought and experience of the Church. From this point of view, three affirmations are made concerning the self-offering of Jesus. It is (1) His perfect obedience to the will of His Father; (2) His perfect submission to the judgment of God upon sin; (3) the perfect expression of His perfect penitence for the sins of men. Due consideration is given to the objections sometimes raised against the conception of vicarious penitence, and it is urged that the offering only avails in so far as the individual shares in its redemptive power. In the closing pages the author relates his findings to Christian worship and practice.

We predict that this book will speedily be recognized as a standard work on the Atonement. It is marked throughout by religious insight, competent scholarship, courageous thought, and lucid expression. Emphatically this is a contribution which no serious student of theology can afford to neglect.

THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY.

The Future of Christianity, by Professor E. S. Brightman (Abingdon Press; \$1.50), is a sturdy and vigorous book, realistic in style and direct in statement of problems, tending at times to rely on assertion rather than reasoning, but accurate in

its analysis of present situations and optimistic in its presentation of possible solutions. Those who have a liking for metaphysical completeness may be troubled by the author's dualism, according to which God is represented as constantly struggling with a mass of obstacles and suffering which He did not create but has to bear as a burden; but the whole trend of the book is towards a deepening of the conviction of the supremacy of a God of goodness; and the writer's faith is triumphantly expressed over and over again, especially in his concluding pages. For him, God alone has a totalitarian claim on life, and can make good that claim.

The end of the book is better than its beginning. In the opening chapter the dissertation on the rather commonplace consideration that all our knowledge and all our action is for the sake of the future, and the elaborate distinctions drawn between the predictions of science and the predictions of faith are hardly necessary for the main argument. The chapter on the future of the Bible and of the Church contains much penetrating analysis. If the reading of the Bible seems to have fallen on evil days, this, according to the author, is due to the complexities introduced by the substitution of the Modernist for the Fundamentalist point of view; to the mechanized character of present-day civilization which makes the Biblical environment seem archaic; and, finally, to the growing consciousness of the misuse of the Bible in education which has led to a demand for the abandonment of its use altogether. But remedies can be found, in a scientific and more truly historical study of the Bible, and in a transition from a dogmatic to a functional view of its value. Dr. Brightman does not falter in his belief in the central importance of the Bible for the future of religion; 'the Bible will be of permanent value as long as there is any religious faith in the world.' The Church, also, notwithstanding its present spiritual inertia, its tolerated divisions, its failure to bridge the gulf between the learned and the unlearned in religious matters, its lack of effective social programme, is a necessity for Christianity, and there are grounds for encouragement regarding its future when we compare its present situation even in its darkest colours with its condition in some of the periods of the past, and when we note also the signs of co-operation, the weakening of conservatism, and the undoubted strengthening within the Church of a social conscience.

Dr. Brightman is at his best in his chapter on belief in God. He has a genius for discovering confessions of faith even in the writings of professed

atheists, and finds, for example, that Bernard Russell in his distinction between what is worthy and what is unworthy, is implicitly affirming a faith in the divine source of values. The author himself is fully ready to admit that there must be changes in the nature of belief in God, and that 'the only really unorthodox thinker is one who thinks he knows all about God, and all he needs to know.' His own faith he bases mainly upon the trustworthiness of the universe, implied in the validity of scientific knowledge and the aspirations of human life. In addition he asks us to reflect upon the significance of the possession of reason and of human personality, upon the emergence of novelty—so greatly stressed by modern scientists—which surely cannot be emergence out of nothing. Finally, those who profess to pay attention to facts must take account of all the facts, and surely cannot on this principle, disregard the data of universal religious experience.

The last chapter of the book deals with the problem of man, and establishes the conclusion that every reason for faith in man is a reason for faith in God. Various schemes for the future of mankind detached from the thought of God, are passed in review. From some of them Dr. Brightman can extract testimony out of what is apparently anti-religious. Communism, for example, is 'for ever seeking an ideal end by unideal means which contradict the end sought,' and one part at least of the meaning of Communism and Fascism alike is that 'God is using them to demonstrate to enfeebled Christendom the transforming power of faith.' All the schemes indeed which leave out religion are not so much a peril to Christianity as a challenge to it and an opportunity for it. There is in general abundant reason for hopefulness. Pessimism, even, is a contradiction to its own gloom, for no one could be a pessimist who did not entertain an ideal of something better, and the driving force of radicalism and conservatism alike is to make the future beautiful and secure. Acute though the present crisis may be, there is yet less blindness and ignorance about it than about any previous crisis in the history of the world. The Christian moreover may go further than knowledge of need; he may, and must, have assured faith in a Christian solution of world-problems both as they affect the individual and the race.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.

Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed of Chicago has added to his already numerous publications a full-dress

Introduction to the New Testament (Cambridge University Press; 11s. 6d. net). In his preface Dr. Goodspeed truly remarks that the primary concern of the writer on Introduction is to interpret, to make understandable, the literature he deals with, to appreciate and appraise the use his authors have made of their sources, and to find out the ends to which they used them. The science of New Testament Introduction, he holds, has suffered from the 'atomism' which, in pursuing little problems and small sections, loses sight of the significance of the whole. In general we agree; but we wish that Dr. Goodspeed had been a little more specific. For when we read his own Introduction we find it just like several others that have appeared in recent times. The most interesting point he makes is about *corpuses* (the plural is his). It was a decisive thing, he holds, for Christian literature when the first corpus was published, and our New Testament writings fall into groups according as they were written before or after the appearance of the first corpus, which consisted of the Pauline letters. There was risk of their disappearance, but some thirty-five years after Paul's death the publication of Luke-Acts led to a revival of interest in Paul, and somebody gave himself the pious task of collecting and publishing as a corpus what letters of Paul he could find. That set the fashion, and in due course there appeared the *corpuses* of the Pastorals, the Letters to the Churches of Asia, the Johannines, the Ignatians, and so on. This is certainly interesting and not improbable. The existence of the Paulines as a corpus may be said to be demonstrated by the fact that in later literature which quotes Paul the whole corpus is quoted from, with some exceptions which admit of easy explanation.

When, however, Dr. Goodspeed argues that our 'Ephesians' is a sort of introduction to the Pauline corpus from the hand of its editor, we find it extraordinarily difficult to believe. Dr. Goodspeed attempts no explanation of why an introduction to the Paulines should be so difficult in language, syntax, and thought, as every expositor finds 'Ephesians' to be. Many will continue to regard our 'Ephesians' as 'the letter from Laodicea' (Col. 4¹⁶) more probably than our 'Philemon' as Dr. Goodspeed, following Wieseler, argues.

The principle of avoiding troublesome details is surely carried too far when Dr. Goodspeed avoids all reference to the most difficult questions raised by Galatians,—the visits to Jerusalem, the Council of Jerusalem, and the circumcision of Timothy in

the very region to which, on Dr. Goodspeed's view, the Epistle was addressed.

We do not quite understand why in dealing with the Gospels the writer gives no consideration to the views of Dibelius and Torrey. No student is fairly treated unless those theories, the most important that have been advanced in recent years, are explained to him.

While we feel constrained to pass those criticisms, we cordially welcome the admirable treatment of the purpose of the individual books of the New Testament, and the excellent summaries of their contents.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

Some thirty years ago Sir Robert Falconer, K.C.M.G., D.Litt., D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., demitted his Chair of New Testament Greek in Pine Hill College, Halifax, in order to fill the position of President of the University of Toronto. For twenty-five years the heavy administrative duties of that high office prevented his having much time for the continuance of those New Testament studies, the fruits of which had been so widely appreciated. We rejoice that the leisure which is now his has recalled him to his desk as a New Testament scholar. We owe to his renewed study a notable contribution—*The Pastoral Epistles: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (Clarendon Press; 12s. 6d. net). The work has a special interest to us because the reason for its production is the dissatisfaction which Sir Robert felt with the article on the Pastorals which he contributed to the 'Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.' This book certainly does not make the article obsolete but supplements and corrects it. Since the article was composed much has been written on the Pastorals, and Sir Robert's own mind has been busy, and now we have a work on the Pastorals which no New Testament scholar or student can afford to neglect.

For long the Pastorals have been felt to present problems, and scholars are not nearly unanimous as to the solution. Few will now be found to maintain that as we have them they come from the pen of St. Paul. Linguistic and theological considerations forbid that view. There is general agreement that the three Epistles are a *corpus* constructed out of various original materials some of which were written by St. Paul, but opinions differ as to how much is from his hand, and still more as to the circumstances under which the Pauline and the other fragments were written.

In his 'Introduction' Sir Robert gives his own

view of such questions. The earliest in time is the Epistle to Titus. As we have it, it contains the instructions which Paul had given to Titus written down by Titus himself for the benefit of the Cretan Church authorities. Second Timothy contains the largest amount of genuine Pauline material. It is a message of Paul to Timothy which St. Luke actually wrote, its diction showing strong Lukan traits. Those two letters were edited by one who incorporated some Pauline material, both written and oral, into our 'First Timothy.'

This view does explain the linguistic peculiarities of the group. We have a good deal of genuine Pauline material and some valuable Pauline reminiscences, but written by three different people.

Another problem is to fit the material into Paul's life and into the recorded movements of Paul, Timothy, and Titus. In Sir Robert's view Second Timothy requires an acquittal of St. Paul and a subsequent journey into Asia about A.D. 63. That has long been a favoured hypothesis. The main 'snag' appears in the view of the movements of Titus. Sir Robert has to postulate a visit of Titus to Corinth of which there is no record.

Other matters dealt with are of great interest and value, such as the religious conceptions of the Pastorals, the errors in Ephesus and Crete, and the ecclesiastical organization in those regions.

The translation is excellent, modern but dignified; while the Notes reveal penetrating judgment, and really illumine the text.

WHAT MODERNISM HAS TO SAY.

The Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen was held at Girton College, Cambridge, from 30th August to 4th September, and had as its theme 'Christianity and the Religious Crisis.' Fifteen papers were read, and they are published under that title in *The Modern Churchman* for October (Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net). Among the best known writers are Bishop Barnes, Canon Roger Lloyd, Dr. F. E. Tennant, Canon Guy Rogers, Dr. St. John Ervine (the 'Dr.' gives us a shock. What University did itself the honour of making the eminent author an LL.D.?), Sir Arnold Wilson, Editor of the 'Nineteenth Century,' and Mr. Claud Mullins, the magistrate.

In the first paper Bishop Barnes gives an analysis of 'The Present Religious Crisis.' He thinks that in the last two decades Christianity has suffered a set-back more serious than any which it has experienced since the third century of our era.

The reasons are various—the effects of the new discoveries of science, the corrosive influence of philosophical speculation and the critico-historical investigations of the origin of Christianity. We see the results in every country. In Germany, he says, the tide has been checked a little by the dictatorial, rhetorical, and anti-intellectual movement led by Barth. But in England we see it flowing strongly. Church attendance is little more than a quarter of what it was a generation ago. None of the churches can get an adequate supply of the right kind of men for their ministry. The number of men and women who are ready to give religious instruction in the schools is diminishing. And (worst of all) there has been a serious decline in personal interest in religion.

This depressing analysis is followed by several essays in which the relation of the Church to various branches of knowledge is expounded: the New Science and the New Philosophy, Modern Historical Research and Biblical Criticism, the Economic and Political Situation, and the New Morality. These lead to another series on the solutions of the modern problem offered by various systems of life and organization—Communism, Fascism, Democracy. Three very interesting papers discuss the Fundamentalist solution (a courageous, original, and positive contribution), the Humanist solution, and the Romanist solution. Mr. Mullins then tells us how much real Christianity is to be found outside the churches, and pleads for a recognition of it. And finally we have the essay on what is to be done about it: 'The Opportunity and Mission of the Church of England.'

We confess to some feeling of disappointment with this volume and its contents. It is all so negative. We must get rid of the dogmas of the past—that is the burden of a great deal of it. But what are we to present to men in the place of that which we throw away? That is the weakness of this Conference. Some time ago a distinguished Liberal theologian said that the defect of the Liberal School was that it has no gospel, and that it would never win the world till it showed that it had a gospel. It is the suspicion of this more than mere traditionalism that makes many people Fundamentalists. They feel that without a positive redeeming gospel we have nothing to say to the world's need. A great deal of what is written by these able men is true. Much of the criticism levelled at the Church hits the mark. We shall not save the world merely by 'dogmas.' There is a large body of people who try to practise Christ's teaching outside the Church. We must open our minds to the new knowledge.

We must accept the truth wherever we find it, and give it a place in our Christian philosophy. All that is true, and worth saying again and again. But we wish the writers of this volume could have asked each other: 'What really is our message to the sin and distress of the world?' and have put the answer in one more essay.

BEATRICE HANKEY.

The life and work of Beatrice Hankey illustrate a rare combination of the sources and principles of true Christian evangelism and philanthropy—the early home-life with the Mother's influence at its centre in some peculiarly happy and original ways; the care of an invalid sister; the long years of quiet preparation, with a Bible Class and faithful Bible study, for wider work; the willingness to be led on against personal desire, and apparent aptitude; the importance, training, and oversight of the Group; an unfailing gaiety in the home, in the house-party, or in the huts; the peace and beauty of the short last days, when the work was done—all these things stand out in the story which has been told by Charles E. Raven and Rachel F. Heath. The title of the biography is *One Called Help* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). We are led on from the Bible Class and temperance work among the fisher-folk at Walmer, through the lonely wrestling on the moors that stormy Whit-sunday, to the formation of the fellowship of the Knights, the house-parties at the Chantry at S. Augustine's and the wider Camelots, and thence to the Pilgrim groups ever ready for immediate pioneer service, in the Home huts and parochial missions during the War, and afterwards to the stricken areas of the Staffordshire and South Wales coalfields.

The idea of the Knighthood sprang from an interesting instance of the way in which a thought can grow as it is translated into another language: the term for a disciple, 'the learning knight' (*knecht*) meant originally just the learning servant, or follower or henchman, but turned into English invited all the associations and inspiration of Mallory and Tennyson, Arthur and the Round Table, of Camelot and the Quests. At the Chantry house-parties each room bore the name of a 'grace,' and its occupant was called by that name during her stay; and it was hence that the two sisters derived the names by which they became so widely known for the rest of their lives, (Pilgrim) Help and (Pilgrim) Rest.

The house-parties developed also into larger

quiet weeks and gatherings, held at Heathfield and elsewhere; the group of leisured young women became an extraordinarily mixed assembly in which 'men and women, young free lances and middle-aged Victorians, Anglo-Catholics and strict Protestants, Tory and Socialist, leisured and labourer, all met together. The family note prevailed but deepened . . . the little group of friends had grown into a family so large that it was no longer possible for each knight to know all the rest. . . . They were scattered far and wide in various capacities, doctors, nurses, missionaries, clergy, teachers, welfare workers, artists, secretaries, business folk; they represented many varieties of Christian experience, and held widely different opinions; but in Knighthood they were one.'

A marked feature of this biography is the, sometimes long, extracts from her commonplace and notebooks, as well as from her letters, forming a considerable and valuable portion of the book. We quote, 'To a Timid Knight.'

'No Knight must say, "I can't do anything myself but I can pray." Prayer is not an idle refuge for the destitute.

'It's not humble, it's merely cowardly and idle to say, "I am not aspiring for any great thing for the King: just to be good in a quiet ordinary way is all I want." You saint George Herbert, would you ever have written those lines beloved by all G.F.S. associates:

"Who sweeps a room as for Thy laws,
Makes that and th' action fine,"

if you could but have known the use that would be made of them? People are too content with "sweeping rooms" (with the inevitable dust involved), when they are called to put out their very best and highest powers of brain and heart and imagination.'

THE ESKIMO.

Mr. C. E. Whittaker has spent fifty years among the Eskimo tribes and so he has every right to be heard when he describes their life and customs. He draws a picture of a quiet, peaceable people, who, in spite of the great hardships of their life, get an amazing amount of quiet pleasure out of everyday happenings. Mr. Whittaker's first years were spent at Herschel Island and the later ones at Fort McPherson. As the latter is the headquarters of the Hudson Bay Company there is little doubt that he is connected with this although it does not seem to be definitely stated. The title of the book is *Arctic Eskimo* (Seeley, Service; 16s. net). Some

idea of its scope can be got from the chapter headings—Eskimo Characteristics, Religion and Allied Subjects, Government and Justice, Diseases and Treatment, Mechanics, Folk-Lore, Whale-Hunting, etc.

In the chapter on the religion of the Eskimo Mr. Whittaker says that, although he greatly admires the work and the writings of Mr. Stefansson, the arctic explorer, on this question he does not agree with him. Mr. Stefansson wrote disparagingly of Eskimo Christianity and declared that all the older beliefs persisted under the newer. Mr. Whittaker, on the other hand, says that 'The acceptance of Christianity has dispelled their fears of malignant nature and given them such a confidence in the overruling beneficence of the greater powers, that their minds have been free to expand in many directions. . . . One observing their daily life, hearing their conversation, seeing their methods, their houses, their furnishings and, above all, their animated faces and sparkling eyes, has no hesitation in saying that life is far richer and more worth while to them than ever before. They have a fine church at Aklavik, the central point of the delta, largely due to their own contributions of cash and labour.'

An interesting experiment made by the Government is described. Herds of deer have been brought from Alaska and the Eskimo are now being instructed in how to care for them. It is hoped soon to be able to distribute the reindeer amongst them when they have learned the art of herding. A certain and sufficient supply of food and clothing will then be assured to them.

Who Are You?, by Mr. Paul E. Johnson (Abingdon Press; \$1.25), is the somewhat whimsical title of a very lively and arresting book. It is a book of popular psychology intended specially for young people. The writer deals with such topics as Personality, a Good Conscience, Adventures in Freedom, Is it Love?, The Goals We Seek. His treatment is characterized by much freshness and humour, but there is a strong vein of sound thought running through it. In the chapter on Right and Wrong some account is given of an interesting investigation by a group of university students who found certain moral values and formulated for themselves a table of standards. It should be said that the writer's conviction is that human personality finds its perfection in Jesus Christ.

The Study of the Bible (Cambridge University Press; 9s. net), by Ernest Cadman Colwell, Assistant Professor of New Testament at the University of Chicago, is designed to orient the reader in the field of the historical and literary criticism of the Bible. The author's learning and competence are beyond question, and the contents of his book are fresh and remarkably varied. The bibliographies are well selected and bear witness in themselves to the author's scholarly discrimination; they will be found useful not only by the student who has a general interest in the subject but also by the student whose interests are specialized. Chapters on the origin, growth, transmission, and translation of the Bible lead to the main part of the work, which deals first with the 'modernizing' method and secondly with the 'historical' method of interpretation. The former method has its feet firmly planted in the period in which the interpreter lives and in which he is, naturally, most interested. The latter method, on the other hand, finds the Bible's basic meaning with reference to the situation in which the Bible was written. It is the only method that commends itself to the scientific student of the Bible, and is cultivated on the sides both of literary and of historical criticism.

The Rev. Theodore Gerald Soares, Professor of Ethics in the California Institute of Technology and minister of Neighborhood Church, Pasadena, has done a very difficult thing with wonderful success. In a small book entitled *Three Typical Beliefs* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. net) he attempts to explain to one another the characteristic position of Roman Catholics, Fundamentalists, and Liberals respectively. He writes impartially and sympathetically; the note of criticism is absent except in so far as the Liberal Creed itself implies a criticism of the two others. The author shows just why the three attach supreme authority to the See of Rome, the Bible, and reason, respectively. Here and there some things seem to us not quite accurate. We may quarrel with the two opening sentences to the effect that Roman Catholicism is 'the most ancient form of Christianity,' and that that creed, ritual, discipline, and worship have continued 'unbroken and unchanged' through the centuries. Nothing could well be further from the truth. Then in the chapter on Fundamentalism the writer identifies Fundamentalism with orthodox Protestantism which can scarcely be allowed. Then we hope he is exaggerating when he says of Liberals that 'they do not know what they will believe next year.' In

passing such criticisms we do not wish in any way to belittle a work which within its limits does much to fulfil the author's aim of affording the three types ready means of coming to understand one another better.

The Faith We Live By, by Mr. Earl L. Douglass (Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.; \$1.50), is an exposition of the Apostles' Creed. Mr. Douglass insists that Christianity is a historical religion, not only in the sense of having appeared in history, but in the sense of being dependent for its power on the facts it contains. Any tendency to belittle the historical element in Christianity robs it of its power. It is not a system of ideas but a supernatural revelation appearing in the stream of history. It is from this point of view the various statements in the Apostles' Creed are elucidated. The book will be found helpful by ministers and others whose duty it is to present the Christian facts in a simple form.

A book about Christ that has a point and purpose of its own is *The Man that Changed the World*, by Mr. Frederick B. Fisher (Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.; \$2.00). On the 'jacket' we are assured that 'surprise, pleasure, shock, satisfaction, the stimulation of new thoughts . . . these are some of the experiences which await the readers of this book, containing as it does a fresh understanding of Jesus.' It would be difficult to say more than that about Shakespeare or Homer, and publishers do a real disservice to a book by such exaggerations. But Mr. Fisher has really something to say, even if he says it somewhat flamboyantly. His point is that Christianity has been injured by being tied to the Old Testament. Jesus is the heir of all the ages and all the faiths. He is the product, not of the Jewish system, but of all Eastern religions. He is the answer to the thirst of humanity for life which these faiths express. The chapters of the book are entitled: The Ages that Yearned for Him, The Land that Cradled Him, The Church that Nurtured Him, The Messengers that Lived for Him, The World that is Being Made by Him, and The Soul that Finds Itself in Him.

The Rev. Ernest G. Braham, M.A., Ph.D., in *Personality in Philosophical Theology* (Epworth Press; 10s. 6d. net), does not claim that his study is original, and he is justified in his modesty, for although he gives us an excellent account of the leading philosophies from Plato to Kant, with occasional references to more modern writers, it

cannot be said that he has presented us with much new matter or drawn any very fresh conclusions. He is right, however, in holding that the wider task he has undertaken is essential for an appreciation of his main purpose, namely, the setting forth of the development of the conception of personality. According to him, personality cannot be studied abstractly, but only in relation to the complete philosophical system of any writer. He therefore attempts to show that, however strongly any particular philosopher may profess to be indifferent to or to destroy the notion of the self, it is impossible to do this, and the sceptic must bear testimony implicitly at least to the fundamental importance of personality. For Locke, for example, personality is the central point of his discussion, and the relevant fact which makes his position intelligible, and even for Hume the self remains even when he has sunk within himself and fancied that he had discovered absolutely nothing; after all the impressions of which he makes so much must be his own impressions or they again are nothing.

Dr. Braham is a little hard on Descartes. He refuses to allow him the title of the 'Father of modern philosophy,' he demolishes the logical cogency of his famous *cogito ergo sum*, and he will not agree that he was so independent of former philosophers as he conceived himself to be. According to this criticism, Descartes' universal doubt, his subjectivism, his mathematical method, can all be paralleled in passages from Augustine.

In general Dr. Braham's thesis is that, as regards personality, idealism is faulty in that it sacrificed the individual to the whole, while rationalism gives on the whole a more favourable place to personality. The Aristotelian tradition is more to be trusted in its developing consequences for this subject than the Platonic, for dualism is above all the enemy of any true conception of personality. The inherent difficulties of interactionism and parallelism cannot be overcome from any dualistic point of view. In his concluding chapter Dr. Braham argues acutely and convincingly that personality cannot be conceived of in terms of mind only but essentially consists of body-mind in constant unified relationship. He shows, with special emphasis on Thomas Aquinas, that all the great thinkers of the past have supported this view, and many modern thinkers as well, such as Stout, McDougall, and Laird. The book concludes with a statement of the moral argument for immortality, which is based upon the view that a man cannot consistently and persistently lead a good life unless he is convinced that reality responds to his efforts.

In view of the approaching Quatercentenary of the English Reformation to be observed in 1938 various books have been and are to be published. Nothing can be more appropriate than a reissue of Moulton's *The History of the English Bible* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). This work, written by Dr. W. F. Moulton as far back as the seventies of last century, and characterized by that great scholar's learning and accuracy, passed through several editions, and was finally revised and extended in 1911 by his two sons, Dr. J. H. Moulton and the Rev. W. F. Moulton. This revised edition has now been abridged by Dr. A. F. Harrison. The abridgment is rather drastic, reducing the book to about half its size, but doubtless this has been done in the interests of a wider popularity. It gives the general reader a very fair and sufficient account of the history of the English Bible from the days of the early Saxon paraphrases down to the time of the Revised Version. Some note might have been added in regard to more recent versions which have attained a considerable degree of popularity, but as it is the book is packed full of first class material.

In *He Leadeth Me*, by the Rev. J. Brice, M.A. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), we have given to us a series of short devotional studies which appeared first in 'Joyful News.' They are written in a style that is simple and effective, and they deal with subjects which are vital to the culture and maintenance of the spiritual life. They are scriptural and evangelical, lit up here and there with apt illustrations.

To mark the fiftieth year since his own Ordination Dr. Herbert Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham, has collected into a volume a number of the Charges (twelve in all) he has addressed to Ordination Candidates on the day before their Ordination, together with the Fourth Quadrennial Charge to the Clergy in his Diocese, and the Sermon he preached in Durham Cathedral on the fiftieth anniversary of his own Ordination. The volume is entitled *Ad Clerum* (Hodder and Stoughton; 5s. net). One cannot but admire these Ordination Charges not only for their simplicity and clarity and their mellow wisdom but also for their varied contents. Dr. Hensley Henson has not been tempted, or at least has not succumbed to the temptation, to harp only on one string. And they must have served their purpose well. We commend them to the notice of any to whom it falls to give similar Charges.

in *Problems of Faith and Conduct*, by the Rev. W. S. Hooton, M.A., B.D., with a foreword by the Rev. J. Russell Howden, B.D. (Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions; 1s. net). The subjects dealt with are the Nature of the Gospel, Prayer, Modern Criticism, Prophecy and the Advent, The Limits of Controversy, and The Limits of Co-operation. The point of view is traditional, but the treatment is intelligent, and everywhere the writer reveals an honest and convinced sincerity. One point of great importance may be noted. Is it not a serious and dangerous error to bind the authority of Jesus to a particular view of Scripture?

The Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., on his consecration as Bishop of Derby delivered certain addresses to the clergy of his diocese. These he has now published under the title of *The Church and the Challenge of To-day* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net), and in doing so he has laid ministers and workers in all the churches under a debt. For these addresses are full of ripe wisdom and wise guidance. He emphasizes throughout the primary need of evangelism, and sees in the earnest prosecution of this work the best hope for spiritual unity among the churches. Other matters dealt with are Religious Education, Pastoral Methods, the Reserved Sacrament, and Christian Marriage. Every reader must be impressed with the fine Christian tone in which these subjects, some of them highly controversial, are here discussed.

Christian Morals, by the Very Rev. M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. (Longmans; 5s. net), is a timely book. Father D'Arcy is convinced that a statement and defence of fundamental principles of morality are overdue. There is a tendency to-day to base conduct on convenience and feeling, and this is due to ignorance of the deep, permanent realities that govern human welfare. The result of this tendency when embodied in practice is to identify certain Victorian conventions with the ancient morality itself, and the baby is thrown out with the bath water. This is specially true of some social distresses which we tend to sentimentalize instead of interpreting them by the sound laws of God.

In conducting his investigation of moral principles Father D'Arcy begins with the nature of human personality, and moves from that to the will of God for man, believing rightly that we must first understand what we are before we can find what is good or bad for us. The chapters of this book were originally broadcast talks; and the book includes

Evangelical conservatism is represented worthily

additional chapters on such subjects as Pacifism, Marx, Moral Judgment, and The Spiritual Principle in Man.

Dr. R. H. Malden, Dean of Wells, has completed a series of lectures which was begun in 1935 with the Old Testament and continued in 1936 with the Deutero-Canonical books. They are published under the title, *The Authority of the New Testament* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). The title may mislead; and a better title would be, 'The Nature and Contents of the New Testament.' It is the author's aim to sketch in popular terms the view of the New Testament which modern critical scholarship has established, and at the same time to point out that modern critical scholarship has not impaired the significance of the New Testament as the supreme and final authority in all matters relating to faith and morals. The author has succeeded well in his aim, showing himself, as in the previous volumes, a master of the art of popular exposition. The scope of the volume may be gathered from the main chapter headings, which are—(1) The Early Documents; (2) The Gospels; (3) The Canon and Inspiration; and (4) Christian Ethics.

The story of the Scottish Church in Italy and Malta is presented in *Beyond the Alps*, by the Rev. Albert G. Mackinnon, M.A., D.D. (Oliphants; 3s. 6d. net). It is a story of courage and faith that have been amply rewarded by the service they rendered to successive generations of Scottish people. All Presbyterians who have visited Rome

will remember the little church in which for so long Dr. Gordon Gray ministered, and told the history of Rome to interested hearers, and also the hospitable home in which he and others have entertained wandering Scots. Both in Rome and Malta the Scottish Church cause has gone through many vicissitudes, but it has always had its place and its function, and has done justice to both. Dr. Mackinnon has himself played no small part in the story he has to tell, and for years has worthily upheld the honour and usefulness of the Scottish Church in Italy. There will be many readers for this interesting little volume.

The Student Christian Movement Press has published cheap editions, in paper covers, at 1s. each, of two series of broadcast talks which originally appeared in 1935. They are *The Way to God*, the speakers being the Rev. F. A. Iremonger, Dr. W. R. Matthews, and the Rev. J. S. Whale; and a second volume with the same title, the speakers being the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J., Dr. Raven, and the Rev. G. F. Macleod, D.D. The first volume deals with two topics: What is Man? and Does God Speak? The second has three topics: Jesus Christ, 'Yesterday, To-day and For Ever,' and Abundant Life. In their cheap form, these excellent talks ought to have a very wide circulation. It is one of the greatest reasons for thankfulness that the tone of broadcasting is so sound, and in particular that the religious side of it is being developed so wisely and so positively.

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

I Corinthians i. 10 (Moffatt).

BY PROFESSOR J. F. M'FADYEN, D.D., SERAMPORE COLLEGE, INDIA.

'BROTHERS, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ I beg of you all to drop these party-cries.' Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians gives a vivid picture of a Greek Church in its early days when the members were still wondering how far the new religion was going to lead them. For the most part they were men and women with no distinction of intellect or social status or birth; but they had the nimble wit of the Greek and the Greek love of

discussion. As we read on, we can hear the Christian slave asking: 'If I am now a bond-servant of Jesus Christ, why must I remain in bondage to my human master?' Some were carrying to its logical conclusion Paul's contention that the death of Jesus had ended the dominion of the Law, including, as they claimed, the moral law. Christian women had begun to resent their subordination to men in a Church where, they were

told, there was neither male nor female. There was keen competition as to which of the new spiritual gifts was to be regarded as most important. To their credit be it said that they were concerned about their new duties as well as their new privileges, and had begun to wonder how far their acceptance of hospitality was now restricted in a city in which so much of the meat consumed at table had first been sacrificed to some heathen deity and in which, as in modern India, invitations to festivals sometimes intimated that the function was to be held under the patronage of a 'god.' One wonders whether there is any modern parallel to a Church, composed for the most part of quite humble folks, realizing so keenly, in so short a space of time and in so many directions, the transforming power of the Christian religion.

The members of the Corinthian Church were discussing many problems: one problem they were not discussing, because they did not know it was a problem: the 'schisms' that were arising by the devotion of different groups to different party leaders. It is no accident that, immediately after the greeting and introduction, Paul plunges into this subject. To understand why to Paul these divisions seem so alarming, we have to keep in mind his teaching in the Epistle to the Ephesians; for it is reasonable to suppose that, at least in germ, probably in more developed form, Paul's thought on the relation of Jesus to world-history was already formed. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, as Dr. E. F. Scott has said, 'Paul thinks of Christ as the central principle of existence. When he has gathered back to himself all the multitudinous strands which are now in confusion he will bring the world into harmony.' This work of creating harmony out of discord he accomplishes through His Church.

But what if the Church itself is torn into fragments, if the body of Christ through which he is to break down the barriers that separate men has itself erected barriers between its different groups? The Church has then become a house divided against itself, which cannot stand. There is treason in the very citadel of the Christian faith. No wonder Paul attacks the subject at once and devotes to it nearly one-fourth of the whole epistle. How many parties were there? 1¹² seems to suggest that there were four: A Paul party, an Apollos party, a Cephas party, and a Christ party. At first sight one is tempted to accept the suggestion that 'I of Christ' is an indignant interjection of Paul himself; yet 2 Co 10⁷ implies that then, or later, one or more members of the Church did make

an unctuous claim to belong in a pre-eminent way to Christ; just as some modern missionary societies abjure all names but 'Christian' or 'Disciples,' the only result of their idealism being that they add one more to the already painfully large number of sects.

Whether the 'brother' singled out in 4⁷ is the unnamed leader of another faction, and whether the ironical attack in the following verses is directed against his party or against the whole Church, is not clear. The point, and the only important point, was that the Church, through which Christ was to reunite the scattered fragments of the world, was itself divided into parties whose relation to each other was that of 'jealousy and strife' (3³).

What had caused the divisions? All that has been written on the subject has given us little beyond more or less probable guesses. Dr. Denney tells of a sermon he once heard in which the preacher began by explaining that he had not had time to prepare a regular sermon and so would just give a simple gospel address! It was not a simple gospel in that sense that Paul proclaimed in Corinth, but it was a gospel that began and ended in the Cross of Christ. Or rather, Paul was making an abbreviation which risked misunderstanding when he said that 'among you I resolved to ignore everything but Jesus Christ and him crucified.' Surely Paul could not preach the gospel in Corinth, or anywhere else, without making clear that the Christ crucified was also the Christ risen. There were many other things about Christ and the Christian life that needed to be said. In the course of his correspondence with the Corinthian Church Paul found himself constrained by force of circumstances to say many of them. But, to begin with at least, in his Corinthian preaching, reacting perhaps from the comparative failure of his trial of another method in Athens, he resolved to concentrate on the foundation truth of the Christian religion, the Crucifixion of Christ. To Paul the Crucifixion was not just an important incident; it was *the* incident in the history of the world, the event which gives the key to the interpretation of the history of the universe. In making the Crucifixion central the combined witness of the four Gospels shows that Paul was in line with the testimony of practically the whole Church. The Crucifixion marked the end of an epoch, the end of the reign of law, the end of the dominion of Satan. It would have been more in accordance with the mind of Paul if the year of the Crucifixion rather than the year of the birth of Christ had been taken as the beginning of the Christian era.

In choosing the language in which to expound his gospel to the Corinthians Paul had but one aim: not to be clever or epigrammatic or flowery, but to be understood. One hopes Dr. Moffatt is correct in his translation, 'I never failed to make myself intelligible to you' (2 Co 11⁶). We need not take too seriously the criticisms of Paul's power as a speaker made by members of the opposition at Corinth (2 Co 10¹⁰, 11⁶). It may be that Paul preached best on paper; but one whose public speech secured the results that Paul's undoubtedly did had no need to fear the unkindly comments of disgruntled Corinthians. Yet, in Corinth at least, Paul disdained all the arts of the orator and spoke with no thought of his own reputation but only to convict and convince. In all this Paul had his supporters: 'I of Paul.' Moreover, as he reminds the Church more than once, he was their 'father in God.' It was through him the gospel had been first brought to Corinth, and there would be those among his readers who would be loyal to the Apostle to whom they owed their very souls.

As for the Apollos party, the account given of Apollos in Ac 18²⁴ⁿ implies the writer's admiration for Apollos and none but the happiest relations between him and the circle to which Paul belonged. Nor is it quite necessary to assume that the leader whom Paul seems to be attacking in the passage beginning 1 Co 1¹⁷ and 2¹ⁿ is Apollos. Our suspicion that he is meant would be increased if we could accept the old translation 'eloquent' for the λόγιος of Ac 18²⁴, and it does not seem to be an impossible translation; while his Alexandrian training would strengthen the identification. One would have liked to hear the story from Apollos' point of view. At a time when the fierce criticism of Paul, that had developed before he wrote the concluding chapters of 2 Co, had apparently already begun (1 Co 4³), Paul, who had the missionary's love for his first converts, would not be prejudiced in favour of a rival who now shared the position that he had once held alone. A man of Apollos' ability, learning, and zeal would recognize, as Paul himself recognized, that once the foundation had been laid, a superstructure must be built on it; and on the difficult moral problems that were arising in Corinth there was room for difference of opinion even among Christian leaders. Paul tried to evolve a Christian philosophy of history: Apollos may well have essayed the same task. At best Paul knew only at second-hand of the doings of Apollos, and he would naturally be perturbed if the reports that reached him of the popularity of his brilliant successor

suggested that that popularity was gained at the expense of a distorted gospel.

At all events, whoever was responsible, Paul was persuaded that two mischievous things were happening in Corinth during his absence. The gospel was being advertised by means of rhetoric, 'the harlot of the arts.' Mr. Baldwin once had some strong things to say of the damaging effects in the political sphere of the meretricious use of certain dazzling phrases. Are they any less hurtful in the sphere of religion? In New Testament times men and women were saved by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, crucified and risen. Salvation by moral maxim does not seem any more practicable in our time than it was then.

Paul believed also that the philosophy of the philosophers was being dragged into the service of the gospel, with ruinous results. To understand Paul's perturbation we must remember the close connexion that he saw (Ro 1 and Eph) between a pretentious godless philosophy and moral anarchy. He believed both that the speculations of conceited 'wise' men dimmed their perception of moral truth and that moral licence blinded men to spiritual truth. He is afraid that, on the foundation he has laid, superstructures are being built that will not stand the test of the Day, that the sanctuary of God is being destroyed; and in the later letter he definitely says that another Jesus is being proclaimed, a different Spirit, a different gospel.

In our day what Paul has to say about philosophy applies in an almost greater degree to science, or at least to the pronouncements of the scientist turned philosopher. Till lately we thought of science and philosophy as the preserve of a section of educated men. Now more or less accurate versions of at least the conclusions of scientists and philosophers are the property of the million. In the life of our day Paul would see a confirmation of his belief in the cause-and-effect relation between ungodly thinking and ungodly living. He makes it clear that his quarrel is not with philosophy, but with a philosophy that ignores the central fact in world history. The scientific method, we are told to-day, is the one method of reaching the truth about the world. The Cross of Christ, Paul would reply, is the one fact which, more than any other, illumines the meaning of the world and of history. Many a young Christian student must have realized vividly what Paul meant, when he entered a university and heard theories of the universe expounded by men who never seemed to have heard of Christ or His Crucifixion. 'Too good to be true' is the

verdict with which Priestley dismisses the story of the incarnate Son of God crucified for the sins of the world; and many a 'thinker' of the day would not even pay it that tribute.

Paul has two tests for the validity of any version of the gospel, and the two tests are inseparable: Is it based on the crucified Christ? Has it power, that is, can it do things? One of the surprises of the time is the surprise with which many discover that the Christian religion is meant to do things and actually does them. Are we not to-day trying to separate the two? We are conscious of loss of 'power'; but are we not also conscious of a largely diminished regard for the Cross of Christ, which for Paul was the source and the only source of 'power'? Is it not time we thought out afresh our relation to the Cross and delivered ourselves from the anomaly of our present position? The Cross is still the symbol of the Church. It appears plentifully in our ecclesiastical architecture and as a personal adornment. In most sections of the Church much importance, in some sections very great importance, is attached to the celebration of the sacrament that commemorates the Crucifixion. But the preaching of the Cross, on the somewhat rare occasions when it is preached, meets a need that is no longer keenly felt. Is it possible to present a version of the Christian gospel which is not primarily the story of the crucified Christ? Paul at least would have said 'no.'

Of the Cephas party again, we have no actual knowledge. The one later reference which Paul makes to it adds nothing to our information. It is reasonable to suppose here that we have the earliest appearance of the theory which has played so prominent a part in Church history: that the descent of the spirit from person to person and from generation to generation must be accompanied by physical contact. Peter had been in the most intimate circle of the disciples of Jesus. Whether Paul had ever seen Jesus or heard Him we do not know. Paul made no secret of the fact that his first real contact with the followers of Jesus had been of a violently hostile nature, and that his first vital contact with Jesus was with the risen Christ. If Paul could have foreseen a time when the glorification of Peter would split not only the Corinthian Church but Christendom, he would have had more to say about it and it would have made interesting reading.

One of the sayings of Jesus that enshrines eternal truth is that in the Parable of the Tares and the Darnel: 'An enemy hath done this.' Even the gospel of Jesus Christ has hardly begun to permeate

the world when men, most of them doubtless honestly believing that they are doing God service, are busy sowing weeds among the wheat. Gal. 1 Co and Col. to take only three examples, are largely occupied with Paul's resistance to perversions of the gospel which he believes to be deadly. One of his telling criticisms of those who uttered the party cries is that they exalt the teacher or the leader and correspondingly tend to dethrone Christ. Weymouth's translation may or may not be right in representing Paul as saying that he had deliberately abstained from the practice of baptism in Corinth in case converts would think they were being baptized into his name (1 Co 1⁴⁴). At all events he thanks God that he did abstain, a very remarkable utterance coming from the great pioneer missionary. The Spirit of God blows where it lists, and our ability to influence its movements is strictly limited, far more limited than we commonly allow. Paul says quite bluntly: 'The man who plants and the man who waters are ciphers. It is God that gives the harvest.' We can, we must, do the work that God has given us to do; but when we have done it we are but servants. We cannot have revivals when and where we will. The glorification of the leader takes two forms. When people are turning their backs on the Church, we ask ourselves: 'What is wrong with us?' a healthy question provided we remember that Paul and the Master Himself had their failures. When the harvest is abundant, we tend to say or at least to feel: 'To us be the glory.' One of the happiest features in the very striking mass movement in the diocese of the Bishop of Dornakal in South India is that the Bishop makes no claim to special piety or wisdom or zeal for the missionaries and the Christian forces of the diocese. It is, he says in the true Pauline spirit, the work of God.

How would Paul's teaching on party spirit apply to the divisions of our own day? Later in this epistle Paul is to give regulations for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Into this celebration grave disorders had crept, but there is no hint that the members of the different parties could not all sit at the same Lord's Table. The recent Conferences in Oxford and Edinburgh have given one more proof that the conscience of the Church is seriously perturbed about our 'unhappy divisions,' but there is at times a certain vagueness about the reasons for calling our divisions unhappy. We sometimes find it difficult to join with much sincerity in the self-abasing confessions of sin on this subject to which we are from time to time invited. Why should we don sackcloth and ashes because some

churches prefer a hierarchy while others prefer a more democratic form of government; because some churches baptize infants, while others think that baptism is only for those who have made a voluntary decision to live the Christian life; or because some churches prefer prescribed forms of worship which others believe to limit both freedom and spontaneity? To speak about such divisions rending the seamless robe of Christ seems a misuse of language. It might even be claimed that Christian liberty necessitates the tolerance of a certain variety in creed and forms of worship if not also of Church government.

But our divisions, if not necessarily shameful in themselves, may easily become shameful. In the judgment of many, when we cannot acknowledge as fellow-Christians those whom we know that Paul and our Lord Himself would acknowledge, there is cause for grave searching of heart. Our divisions, again, may well cause us shame if they lead to unseemly competition and rivalry. Fortunately, at least on the mission field, this century has seen an immense advance in the co-operation of churches and a rapid Christianizing of their relations to each other; though there are still missionary societies that prefer to plough their lone furrow or even to plough their neighbour's furrow. We may well feel ashamed also when our divisions partake in any degree of the nature of caste. In South India the Roman Church allows converts from Hinduism to carry with them into the Christian Church the caste distinctions they had as Hindus. (But there is no need to go to India for illustrations. In a village church in Scotland one has worshipped, or tried to worship, in a pew intended for the local shepherd and his family, a pew in which it was difficult to stand upright, while spacious galleries, some of them empty, were reserved for the lords of the manor and their retainers.)

Paul shows his usual Christian sagacity in dealing with the problem of the party cries. Christ, he says,

is not divided. Differences of opinion of many kinds there will and must be among Christians; but none of them must be allowed to obscure our common devotion to our common Lord. He carries his praise of the Christians to the verge of flattery; for it is difficult to reconcile the testimony of 1⁷: 'You come short in no charism,' with much in the rest of the epistle, and especially with the ironical outburst in 4^{8ff}. But Paul is following the pedagogical maxim that criticism of failure must always be accompanied by recognition of achievement. Part of his rebuke is insinuated in the repeated use of the word 'brothers,' a word learned from the Master Himself. So long as Christians regard each other as members of one family, no difference of creed or worship can be an insurmountable barrier. Better unity of spirit with diversity of organization than a union in which there is no brotherly spirit.

In a compartmental church, whatever else may be said of it, there is always one notable cause of impoverishment. When the followers of Paul and Peter and Cephas are contending against each other, the partisans of each leader forget that the other leaders are also their possession. 'All things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas.' This is one of the heaviest prices we pay for our Church divisions, that most of us are in so large measure ignorant of the history and the achievements of churches other than our own. Even when we do know them, we approach them, as it were, from the outside. All who have had experience of Church union know the intangible but very real difference there is between worshipping in a Church as an outsider and worshipping as a member of the family. Here is one contribution that the clergy of all churches can make towards the solution of the Church problem: to teach their people to know and appreciate, even to claim as their own, the saints and the spiritual inheritance of other churches.



In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Golden Eagle.

BY THE REVEREND R. E. THOMAS, M.A., BARNET.

'Swifter than eagles.'—2 S 1²³.

NOT long ago, a magnificent engine stood in a siding at our station. It was the very latest thing in engines, *The Golden Eagle*. In fact, it was so new that it had not actually started to work. It is working now: it takes its train from London to Edinburgh in the record time of six hours.

Well, a great crowd of boys and girls, as well as a good many grown-ups, had gone to have a look at *The Golden Eagle*. We all admired its streamlined beauty, and we stood in amazement at the wonderful things we were told it could do. Then many of us went into the cab of the engine, which, as you know, is the place where the drivers and stokers are. The driver in charge told us all about things. He opened the furnace door and showed us the white-hot fire. He explained the various levers by which the engine is driven—he even let those who wished to sound the whistle, which is different from the whistles of ordinary engines and much more impressive. He explained to us how a great quantity of water could be picked up in an incredibly short time when travelling at full speed. And many other things.

It was all very interesting. But two things above all others struck me.

One was this: We were told how *The Golden Eagle* manages to travel its long journeys in such a short time. The reason is not that the engine races along on the level or downhill faster than other engines. It is that *The Golden Eagle* can go as fast, or almost as fast, uphill as downhill.

And here is the other specially interesting thing: 'That's the speedometer,' said the driver, pointing to a little box with a dial on top and needle to indicate the speed. We looked at the numbering on the dial, going up to a hundred miles an hour, or more. 'Ah,' said the driver, reading our thoughts, 'but it isn't all there. In that box underneath there is a pencil and paper, which also record the speed. You see,' he went on, 'if there were an accident they would want to know how fast we had been going; it would be no use our saying we were only doing fifty miles an hour if we were really doing ninety; the true speed would always be shown in black and white on the paper in the box.'

And now I am going to ask you to put those two things together. I want you to think, however, not of a railway engine, but of these lives of ours.

For one thing, the lives of real power are the lives which, like *The Golden Eagle*, can keep up speed uphill as well as downhill. It is easy to make a good show when all is level going, or when the track slopes downwards. The test comes when hills have to be climbed, difficulties met, obstacles faced, and strains taken. It is the life which can keep going with a good speed then which is the really strong life.

And one of the secrets of being able to do this is to be found in that second thing of special interest I mentioned. The drivers of *The Golden Eagle* know it would never be any use pretending that the speed of their engine was anything else than it actually was, because all the time the speed is being registered in black and white in the speedometer box. They know they must be quite honest about things. Now I do not say that *The Golden Eagle* keeps up its speed as well uphill as downhill because the drivers are honest men. But it is true that if we are to have lives of real power, which can keep going well even when the going is stiff and uphill work, we must first have lives which are honest through and through. It is no good pretending we are one thing when really we are another. We must remember that all the time there is that secret indicator writing its sure record of what we are and what we do. God desires 'truth in the inward parts.' Only lives which are true in that way will be really strong lives, equal to uphill as well as downhill tasks.

No Backbone.

BY THE REVEREND CHARLES DIMOND, STALYBRIDGE.

'How then art thou turned into the degenerate?'—Jer 2²¹.

Jeremiah was concerned because the Hebrews had turned away from God. He reminds them that at the beginning God had started them on the right way of life, but they had lost it and had gone astray. Thinking of them as a people who in the beginning might be compared to a true vine, he asks—'how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine?'

The force of this question came to me after one of my holidays. During a visit to Cullercoats on

the coast of Northumberland, I went into the Marine Aquarium at the foot of the cliff facing the harbour. In one room there were tanks full of all kinds of fishes—herring, codling, plaice, and many others; some of them having exceedingly beautiful colours. As you looked at them through the glass windows in the sides of the tanks, some of the fishes came and stared back at you. In another room were a lot of stone tanks constantly fed with a running stream of fresh sea water, in which various creatures were living—crabs, lobsters, sea anemones, and many other things. A label above one of these tanks stated something like the following:

‘Creatures which start life with the elements of a backbone, but after the early stages, settle down to a sedentary life and lose all trace of this.’

At once these funny little creatures about four inches in height became full of interest. The more I studied them the more interesting they became. That is usually so with all our studies, whatever they may be, physics, chemistry, French, and even maths. These funny little things¹ begin life with a spinal cord, a tail, a brain, a heart, and an eye. They start life with great promise, full of wonderful possibilities; having a backbone, a tail something like that of a large tadpole which enables them to swim about, a brain that ought to develop usefully, and an eye they ought to keep and use. But—they settle down! They lose their tails and cannot swim; all trace of the backbone goes; the brain shrivels up until it is nothing but a tiny hard useless lump; the eye disappears and they cannot see. There they were, degenerate little creatures, stuck to the rock, unable to think, see, swim or move, and with no backbone.

How terribly lazy they must have been to settle down so miserably, losing so many abilities and finally all backbone! It is so pitiable too, when through sheer laziness, the evasion of all effort, the despising of all encouragement to learn and develop, boys and girls degenerate as they grow older.

The brain is given us to use, not to neglect. By using our brain, it can be developed and its powers increased. Some learned folk tell us that our powers of memory are fixed when we are born. But it is a firmly established fact to-day that the memory can be definitely improved by training. We all have visions and ambitions in our early years. Every boy dreams of being an important person some day. Most girls dream of a wonderful home that they hope to possess sometime in the years to

¹ Ascidians—Ciona.

come. But these visions of a better future are so easily lost as the passing years increase in number, unless—to quote a writer you may some day enjoy reading, George Meredith—we ‘plod on and keep the passion fresh.’ Never let your ideals and your high hopes perish; cherish them all the way through life. As an eminent physician once said to a youth in my presence—‘always be aiming at something higher than you have ever yet attained.’ A ministerial friend of mine told me that he always came out top in the Greek exams at college, because the monitor always posted the results on the notice board upside down! But that never discouraged him. He persevered, and to-day he is a most acceptable minister of the gospel, loved and respected by all who know him. But I know a man who used to be the secretary of a large Sunday School in his younger days. He was full of enthusiasm, ideals, hopes, and energy. Then a time came when he was able to buy a comfortable home in the suburbs of a great city, and he settled down in that. Later he bought a comfortable little motor car, and he settled down in that. He gave up his seat in the church; resigned his secretaryship of the Sunday School; lost all his ideals, his vision, his hopes, his energy. He settled down and became a comparatively useless fellow, stuck to the rock of his comfortable and cosy little home.

One of the saddest things that is ever said about a man is that he has not fulfilled the promise of his early years. That, in a sentence, is the whole story of those curious little creatures in the tank. They settled down and lost their vision, their powers, and their backbone.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Values of Jesus.

‘The kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it.’—Mt 13⁴⁵.

If we are anxious to consider the various ideas under which the true life may be summarized, we are bound to come, sooner or later, to the idea of life as a discovery. Life is a search. Both in the Old and New Testament there is a great deal said about seeking. Old Testament worthies were commended because, like Ezra, they prepared their hearts to seek the Law. The author of Ecclesiastes declares that he gave his heart to search and seek out wisdom. In the Psalms again and again there is expressed that noble desire, ‘O God, thou art

my God ; early will I seek thee.' In the teaching of the Lord Jesus we cannot ignore the definite injunction to seek first the Kingdom of God. And in one of His pictorial passages our Lord declared that the Kingdom of Heaven could be thought of in terms of a search. It was, He said, 'like a merchant seeking goodly pearls.'

Much of the success and happiness that come to us depends on the attitude we adopt to life itself. In this, as in most things, we differ greatly one from another. Charles Dickens's father was easy tempered and improvident. He had a very hopeful disposition that things would turn out all right. They didn't turn out all right, and Dickens senior was arrested for debt and sent to the Marshalsea prison. Possibly it was with this in mind that Charles Dickens immortalized Micawber, who always hoped that something would 'turn up' to lift him out of his difficulties. Micawber has many followers to-day. There are men and women, even young men and women, who are always prepared to take the line of least resistance, to wait peaceably until something happens to their advantage.

But many of life's greatest values lie hidden from our gaze. Gold is not found casually by the wayside. If it were, it would cease to have much value. And the world owes a great debt to those who go through life searching for its treasures. They pursue their search very often in the most unlikely places. There is a district south of Palestine, the Sinai peninsula, a place of sweltering valleys and iron mountains. To look at it one would never imagine that it contained anything of value. But strangely enough it has always been one of the treasure-houses of the world. In the olden days the Egyptians, we are told, used to come here in search of turquoise and malachite and copper ore. And in the nineteenth century in this unlikely district there was discovered by Dr. Tischendorf one of the world's great treasures—a codex of the Bible dating from the fourth century.

There is hardly a department of investigation which does not yield similar stories. And, to go into other realms, what tremendous truths about human nature have been at last laid bare through the energy of scientists. A short time ago an eminent scientist reminded us of Harvey's epoch-making discovery of the circulation of the blood. The way of knowledge has never been easy to travel. Pioneers have had to endure ridicule and even persecution . . . but they believed in the value of their quest. There is hardly anything in our modern world which we do not owe to the enthusiasm of the seeker.

The same principle holds true of the life of the soul. There is no way of attaining the serene heights of noble character except by climbing. The Transfiguration was on the mount, not on the plain. Life's deepest harmonies are not heard unless we attune our ears to them. One does not stumble upon the City of God ; it is only found by those who seek ; and the rich treasures of Christ are only theirs who deliberately set themselves to cultivate His fellowship. Masfield has well expressed this essential attitude of the noble soul.

We travel the dusty road till the light of the day
is dim,
And sunset shows us spires away on the world's
rim.

We travel from dawn to dusk, till the day is past
and by,
Seeking the Holy City beyond the rim of the sky.

But if many of life's true values lie hidden from the casual gaze, it is equally true that they can be found. Masfield does not appear to have always avoided pessimism. He sings :

Not for us are content, and quiet, and peace of
mind,
For we go seeking a city that we shall never find.

There is no solace on earth for us—for such as we—
Who search for a hidden city that we shall never
see.

There is a despairing tendency in such lines which hardly accords with that greater word in the Gospel, 'Seek, and ye shall find ; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.'

It would not be psychologically possible for normal people to go on seeking unless they felt sure that ultimately they would find. A universe where that were possible would be disordered and capricious. It would not be the universe wherein is expressed the goodness of God. Jesus did not dangle before men pleasant but unattainable delights. He knew, none better, that human peace and happiness depend on our finding certain things. It was His mission to help us to find them. They can be found.

Can a man who has fallen by the way rise again, and find again his true place in life ? Can a mother, sorely stricken in the hour of bereavement, find again the joy she had lost through the death of her child ? Can a sinner who has turned his back on God look again into God's face and find tenderness there ?

These are not idle queries. When we come to the level of our common life we discover that these are the real things men are anxious to find. The most anxious searches in which men engage are not those for diamonds and gold and fame. They are searches for peace of mind, assurance of forgiveness, certainty about the life to come. These are the values that men need most.

The true values of life, thus possible of attainment, are attained only at a price, and by an effort. 'For that one pearl,' the merchant said, 'I would give everything.'

One of the troubles of our day is that so many expect to receive the pearl without making any definite effort toward it. This may be due to the fact that this generation has inherited so much from the past. Our fathers have done so much for us. It is their devotion, and often sacrifice, which opened many of the avenues along which now we travel. In nearly every realm they fought their battles for education, for freedom in worship, for better conditions of life, and all that most of us have had to do is step in and enjoy the advantages.

So it is true of a great many to-day that they are very ready to receive, but extremely slow to give; willing to accept the many advantages handed down from other generations, but reluctant to face the important task of creating a better world for generations to come. The attaining of life's great treasures, said Jesus through His parable, depends at least on two factors. We need a great desire for the pearl of life, and we need that spirit which will bend every effort to secure it.

Such a lesson is not without point for the modern Church. It is all to the good that we occasionally remind ourselves that the Kingdom of God is something most desirable. Long ago Jesus saw in vision the time when men and women would come from every quarter of the globe to form the true fellowship of God's Kingdom. Have we lost that vision? Does the ideal of Jesus for the world still come to us with the appeal it had in earlier days? Again and again we need to say to ourselves, 'amid the varied treasures which this world offers, nothing can equal in value the supremacy of Christ's ideals. This is the great objective before which all else is secondary.' If the ideals of Jesus are worth while, surely there is no effort we will not make that His Kingdom may be established among men. We may feel it to be an effort, in the economic stress of modern life, to preserve our Christian standards, but the welfare of the world demands that we do adhere both in letter and spirit to the higher way.

We may feel it a temptation, when so many ignore Sunday to join the pleasure-loving throng. But the spiritual life of our nation demands that at all costs we keep burning the flame upon the altar. Often we may have felt like giving up the struggle for personal piety, the cultivation of the nobler powers of the soul. But that struggle may never be relinquished.

What are we willing to be and to do for the sake of those great values which Jesus placed before men? ¹

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

The Danger of Comparison.

'Who is left among you that saw this house in its former glory? and how do ye see it now? is it not in your eyes as nothing? . . . saith the Lord of hosts. The latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former.'—Hag 2^{3,9} (R.V.).

These discouraging old men who could recall what the former Temple was like before the sack and destruction of Jerusalem had really something to say for themselves. It is easy to talk of restoring the past, but above a certain level of quality, is restoration really possible? The Temple as it had been was glorious not merely with the lavish wealth of Solomon but with objects which in their nature could not be replaced. The ark was there and the Mercy-seat, and the cherubim. According to steadfast tradition the tables of stone had been there, and the pot of manna, and Aaron's rod—things all of pure miracle, which the most cunning craftsman could never reproduce. Some poor imitations might be furnished, but the magic of association would be absent.

So they might and so they did affirm, with a clear show of truth, yet essentially theirs was an ungodly opinion. Those objects whose loss they mourned—the ark, the manna, the tables of stone—were nothing more than tokens and reminders of the activity of God, and surely He might discover other memorials of His presence; but of this the old men had no thought. Since they were tired and done, their one contribution was to damp the enthusiasm of those who were making a great adventure. Such depressed and timorous souls are likely always to forget three great certainties of faith—that since God is alive He may repeat Himself, doing again what He once has done: that since God is a Spirit—most high, most free—He may not repeat Himself, but may find other ways of working: and that since God is Almighty, He

¹ F. Townley Lord, *Christ on the Road*, 121.

may exceed Himself, so that the greatest amazements may be still in store.

1. If God is alive *He surely may repeat Himself*: what He has done He is able to do again. There was a group of famous English writers who systematically made use of history to explore the nakedness of the present. 'We are selfish men,' cries Wordsworth, and he calls upon Milton to 'return to us again, and give us manners, virtue, freedom, power,' as if these had all become glories of the past. Ruskin found his standard of civic life and law in old Venice; Froude saw manhood and capacity complete in the England of Elizabeth, and pointed with scorn to the increasing degradation of to-day.

But the right study of history gives us measures not only for judging the present but for pitching our expectations with regard to the future. It exhibits the life and the thoughts of God passing into men and raising them above themselves to sudden clearness of view and nobility of action. It shows how from obscure beginnings movements have been guided to the very grandest issues, and thus it admonishes us not to despise the day of small things. We may criticise performance as we will and thus urge men on to do better, but we must never disparage possibility, for that is God's part.

If we look too curiously at the human actors it is easy for us to lose heart. We measure ourselves in stature against the men of old and feel like pygmies walking between the legs of a giant race. Yet these big men prospered largely because they did not think about their own dimensions; a work was waiting to be done, and, putting their hand to it, they grew great with the greatness of their task. This Temple of Solomon had once itself seemed altogether too poor and narrow for its purpose. 'Will God indeed dwell upon the earth?' was the cry of its builder: 'behold the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee, how much less this house which I have builded!' So it was not Solomon but God who gave that house its glory. And this God is our God, who ever liveth, and who only doeth wondrous things.

2. These men forgot that *God* who is spirit *may not repeat Himself*. They fancied that there was only one way in which God's House could be worthy of Him, and as they recalled the many details of adornment which could not be replaced they already in their hearts accepted failure. Their dream was of an exact restoration, a Temple such as it used to be; but God is always changing the world, and thus He makes any slavish attitude to the past unseemly. It is not only hard, it is im-

possible to repeat the achievements, and exactly to renew the forms, of other days; but God is always making new things, and He intends us to do the work of to-day in such fashion as the times allow. He calls children into a world different from that which their fathers knew, and of each He then requires a service which is his own. Of the innumerable queer things in Nature George Herbert says:

To show Thou art not bound, as if Thy lot
Were worse than ours, sometimes *Thou shiftest hands*.

Augustine by thought and study and prayer seeks to touch God, mind to mind, which, surely, is a glorious ambition in life. But then comes Francis, with a laugh and a song and a benediction for every living creature. He has no keen interest in books or thought, but through him a host of tired and hopeless creatures in Italy got a vision of Jesus Christ. That, certainly, was also a life in God. Yet neither Augustine nor Francis knew what Luther knew of that loving sentence of pardon by which God separates a man—and for ever—from his past of guilt. Thus in age after age we see God fulfilling Himself in many ways; and we sin against Him and against ourselves when we refuse to recognize His grace and power except on lines which have become familiar. That is a kind of idolatry, and to many of the Jews Solomon's Temple was as much an idol as any god of wood or stone, for to them it seemed absolutely to match God's greatness that no departure from it in any single point could be allowed.

Should we not give thanks for this continual change which keeps our spirits fresh, and exercises our faculty in following Him as in many parts and in many ways He reveals Himself. The peculiar distinction of Solomon's Temple had lain in the gorgeousness of its array, but now a plainer house was rising, the love-gift of a poor people, and this fact also might lend it beauty. If they had known, that plainness marked a stage in the progress towards Jesus—God's Living Temple, where material glitter was wholly lacking, and the majesty lay in the spirit.

Our God dwells not in a Temple which stands unchanging throughout the generations, but in a living house which is continually being builded by new men, and which always calls for other kinds of service. What is asked of us is that, putting God first, we should bring the offering of our best to Him who is ever making new things.

3. But there is another stage: these old men were forgetting that *God, Who is Almighty, may exceed Himself*. So long as God lives we may

confidently expect things which eye has not seen nor ear heard. This blunt, ungifted, old prophet, unabashed by the surface look of things, doggedly declared that the glory of His latter house was to be greater than the former. When the Baptist for a while had dazzled the eyes of his contemporaries, Jesus, who acknowledged all John's greatness, yet declared that 'he who is but little in the Kingdom of God is greater than he.' You must not dream, said Jesus, that even the Baptist is God's last word of help; and, in harmony with this, He continually pointed forwards. On the night before our Lord suffered He declared, 'He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my father.' That is a lesson which we greatly need to learn: our business is not only with the past, we have to welcome glories on their way.

Those who live near God are conscious that they are always within a step of undreamed-of glories of change. They have seen how a single word from God may transfigure a whole life; how, finding a man hopeless and forlorn, it may flood his heart with enduring sunshine; and, having seen this, they know that where God is all things are possible.¹

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Love of God.

'For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.'—Jn 3¹⁶.

Beyond this message we cannot go. There is no higher conception of God, and there is no conception that so grips the heart of man. It is so simple that a child can feel the uplift and the charm, so deep that the saint dies with these unfathomed words on his lips.

The casual reader of the New Testament feels, as he reads the words, 'For God so loved the world,' that these are not an exact report of the words of Jesus. There is the atmosphere of the Johannine vocabulary about them. If that be so, is it not a greater tribute that Jesus was such, that one of the men who had come under the influence of His life and of His teaching could conceive such words and express therein such a knowledge of God? What a power, what a beauty, what winsomeness there must have been about the Jesus of History!

If we lost the whole of the New Testament save these words, great would be our loss, yet in this verse we should have the Alpha and the Omega of the gospel. From these words as from a fountain we should find all the necessary knowledge of God,

of man, of sin, of salvation, and of the importance of this life and its abiding issues.

The Parable of the Prodigal Son, the Parable of the Two Debtors who could not pay and whose creditor forgave them, are pictures of this verse, a bodying forth in the form of a story of the theology and the philosophy contained in the verse. God gives His only begotten Son as Saviour, not as Judge.

The life of Jesus is this verse in action, such action as has altered the face of the earth, and is slowly altering the very heart and hopes and aims of man. 'God so loved the world' is the keynote of that Life which gave itself up for the sheep. He prayed for His very murderers.

God did not make the world and then go away, as St. Augustine reminds us. He made the world and then gave His only begotten Son to redeem and reconcile the children of men. This love of God is the key which gives meaning to His life. Without it, that life would still have been a life of beauty and a joy for ever, but it would not have been our salvation from sin.²

1. Love is always self-imparting. That is its very nature and characteristic—it gives. *Love proves itself in giving.* A love that never poured itself out in lavish giving could scarcely be reckoned to be love at all. Well, God's love proved itself by His gift. 'God so loved . . . that he gave.' And what a gift it was! 'He gave his only begotten Son.' Some commentators on this verse draw a distinction between what God did in the case of the prophets and what He did in the case of Jesus. God *sent* John the Baptist, but He *gave* His Son. Giving is at once a more complete thing than sending. You may send a thing and withdraw it. But when you give there is no withdrawal. Well, God gave His Son. He did not merely send Him, to call Him back again should His mission fail. He 'gave Him,' entirely, absolutely, unreservedly. He delivered Him up to death for us all. And giving is also a more costly thing. Sending need not make much demand upon us, but giving suggests personal sacrifice and loss. And God could not prove His love and save our world by the easy process of sending, but only by the costly and sacrificial process of giving. And the greatness of His love is revealed in the gift He gave. 'God so loved that he gave his only begotten Son.'

Dr. Cynddylan Jones in a book of *Studies in St. John*, writing on this verse, says that the gospel has introduced a new kind of arithmetic, which estimates love not by what is given but by what is

¹ W. M. Macgregor, *Christ and the Church*, 210.

² A. Hird, *The Test of Discipleship*, 108.

left *after* giving. 'She hath given more than they all,' said our Lord about the widow and her two mites. But how did He make that out?—for many had cast large gifts into the Treasury that day. He got at it in this way. He reckoned not by what was given, but by what was left after giving.

And if we apply the same kind of arithmetic to the giving of God, then when He gave His Son He gave the greatest gift even the Infinite God could give. For when He gave Jesus, He had no Son left. He gave all He had, even all His living. But fully to realize the content of that phrase, '*so loved*,' we must remember to what it was God gave Him. He gave Him up to rejection and shame and death. He gave Him to be numbered among the transgressors. He gave Him to be esteemed of men as stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. God knew that in no cheaper way could our redemption be effected, so in the depth and passion of His love He gave Him up for us all.

2. The text not only gives proof of the love of God but it speaks also of the *scope of His love*. 'God so loved the *world*.' It is a universal love. That word '*world*' in the New Testament signifies '*humanity as alienated from God*'—God loved the world with every soul in it.

It is universal to begin with *in its extent*. The love of God is not localized or limited. It is not confined within racial or national boundaries. The Jews believed that the love of God was limited to their own nationality. They were God's children and all the rest were aliens and outcasts. But our Lord repudiated the limits the Jews would thus have set upon the love of God. 'Other sheep I have,' He said, 'which are not of this fold, them also I must bring'—and for those other sheep He gave His life. 'Go into all the world,' was His parting command to His disciples, 'and preach the gospel to the whole creation.' God carried the world on His heart and every soul in it was dear to Him. Here is the nerve of the missionary enterprise—the cannibal of New Guinea, the primitive and half savage folk of Central Africa, they are all embraced in the love of God and for them Christ died.

Then this love is universal *in its reach*. God so loved the world. It is not only that all peoples are embraced in it, but all conditions of people are embraced in it as well.

There are no limitations to this love. People have tried to put limits to it. Christian people have tried to put limits to it—they talked of a limited atonement and they preached a love which was confined to the elect.

The world embraces us all; *whosoever* means everybody, anybody. We remember the remark Richard Baxter made about this verse. 'If it had read "There is mercy for Richard Baxter" or "God loved Richard Baxter," I am so vile, so sinful, that I would have thought it must have meant some other Richard Baxter. But these words "*the world*" and "*whosoever*" include the worst of all Baxters that ever lived.'

3. And the other things about the love of God which our text reveals is *its purpose and design*. 'God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.' First on its negative side. Man is in the position of those bitten Israelites of whom Jesus had spoken to Nicodemus in the conversation which the Evangelist has just recorded. He has got the poison of sin into his system. The virus is in the blood. It is obviously working out its deadly effects upon him. The blighted lives, the broken characters, the defiled souls of men, the loss of honour, purity, aspiration, truth, all proclaim that the wages of sin is death. And that was God's design in sending His Son—to deliver men from the death of sin.

But Salvation is not negative simply, it is positive also. Salvation is not the same thing as *salvage*. A vessel is found in mid-Atlantic, battered and dismantled, and is towed by another vessel into the safety of some harbour. That is *salvage*. But the vessel thus rescued is a poor and shattered hulk. *Salvation* is much more than that. If we may continue the nautical figure—it is the restoration of that battered hulk into all its original strength and grace and beauty of line. 'Should not perish'! He saves us from death. That is *salvage*. But that is only half the story. 'Have eternal life.' That is *Salvation*. It is a new quality of life we get from Christ—a life which death cannot touch and which sin cannot stain because it is the life of God in the soul. That is what *Salvation* means—not escape from some future hell, but eternal life, here and now.¹

I am not skilled to understand
What God hath willed, what God hath planned;
I only know at His right hand
Stands One who is my Saviour.

That He should leave His place on high
And come for sinful man to die,
You count it strange? So do not I,
Since I have known my Saviour.

¹ J. D. Jones, *Morning and Evening*, 92.

Yea, living, dying, let me bring
 My strength, my solace, from this spring,
 That He who lives to be my King
 Once died to be my Saviour.

One man, as he was drawing away from earth, was heard to repeat these words again and again: 'God so loved the world . . . so loved the world. . . .' Then, ere he drew his last breath, he said earnestly, 'God so loved the world . . . Oh! men do not know it. I must return to tell them, to *make* them understand.'

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

His Offer of Himself as Adequate Resources.

'Lo, I am with you alway.'—Mt 28²⁰.

Our theme here is the living presence of Christ as a force in the life of the believer and of the Church. 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations . . . and lo, I am with you alway.' It should be clearly observed that the Presence is indissolubly linked to the obligation. The endowment and the task are intertwined. The equipment and world evangelism must not be separated. If the Presence is sought apart from the task, if the higher friendship is cultivated apart from obedience to the divine will, we shall miserably fail in our quest. On the other hand, if we seek to pursue the adventure of evangelism apart from the reinforcement which the Presence supplies, we shall be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the task. Our only guarantee of success lies in our vital relation to the Presence. Possessing Christ, the Church holds resources that are level to every contingency.

We shall possess, to begin with, *companionship in the midst of loneliness*. And the Christian needs this reinforcement. But the major portion of his life is lived in secret. His struggles with himself, with his temptations; his doubts, and fears, must be fought out in the lonely fastnesses of his soul. The vocation of the Christian also inevitably leads him into spheres of loneliness. Not infrequently he must confront an indifferent, and even hostile, environment. He must cherish and proclaim ideals of life and conduct that are challenging and distasteful to others. This loneliness is bound up with the nature of his vocation.

In 1920 there passed away Mrs. Christina Forsyth, an heroic servant of Christ, who was described as the loneliest woman in the world. For thirty years she lived and laboured amidst the dark-skinned natives of Africa. Between them a great gulf was fixed, in the matter of language, habits, tastes, and

ideals. Some one once ventured to commiserate her on her lot, and this was her reply. 'All these years I have never once been alone, for I have always been conscious of the presence of Jesus.'

That was also the experience of the early apostles. They lived continually in the fellowship of the Presence. They never speak of Jesus, as they spoke of the prophets. They never talk of Him, as though He belonged to the past. They sometimes speak of Him as belonging to the future. But pre-eminently He is their great Contemporary. One of Paul's phrases is 'The Lord stood with me.'

Again if Christ is with us alway, we have the guarantee of *guidance in the midst of perplexity*. Life is a labyrinth, a tangle, a maze of alternative ways, where it is difficult to choose aright.

Sir Ernest Shackleton once found himself amid the snow and ice of the frozen South, with ship destroyed, and his men marooned. With two companions he set out in search of help. As they moved forward over unknown mountains and slippery glaciers, their venture seemed utterly hopeless. But they earnestly prayed for divine guidance, and they received it. They discovered that they were not three but four. 'Boss,' said Worsley, 'I had a curious feeling that there was another person with us.' And Shackleton said, 'So had I.'

Consider the need of these early Christians. They were setting out on the biggest adventure of their lives. They had no rules or precedents to guide them. They had a new Church to create: what was to be the structure of its organization? They had a new gospel to preach: how were they to interpret and apply it? They had a new world to conquer: what routes would they follow? They had new leaders to find: whom would they choose? They were undertaking a new enterprise: what method and what weapons would they employ? Everything was new, untried, experimental. Their primary need was guidance. Yet they went forward in faith and hope, believing that guidance would be forthcoming. And they were not disappointed. The whole history of the Apostolic venture is the bracing record of a Spirit-guided and a Spirit-controlled Church.

Once again, we are promised *fortitude in the midst of trial and suffering*. Sometimes the Christian life is construed as a soft option. It is presented as a way of escape from the rude shocks of life. It is a way of keeping out of trouble. It might more reasonably be presented as a way of getting into trouble. That, at any rate, was the experience of the Apostolic Church. The flaming ideals of the Church challenge

man's easy-going complacency. Its redemptive programme cuts clean athwart the aspirations of the world. So the impact of the gospel on the world is like the meeting-place of wind and tide. There is turbulence and confusion and trouble. Jesus never expected anything else. He said, 'In the world ye shall have tribulation.' What He promised them was not freedom *from* trouble but His presence *in* trouble. 'When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee.' 'Go ye . . . and lo, I am with you always.'

What nameless strength and promise of endurance are folded in that quiet, strong promise: 'What is the secret of your beautiful life?' some one asked Kingsley; and he replied, 'I had a friend.'

Finally, this promise is our guarantee of *adequate resources for fulfilling the obligations of our Christian calling*. This indeed is the strictly textual significance of the passage. Our Risen Lord was commissioning His disciples and sending them forth on the greatest and loveliest adventure of their lives.

Consider for a moment the magnitude of the task that their Master put upon their shoulders. Their business was to overcome the intractable prejudices of their fellow countrymen and cleave a passage through the vested interests of ancient heathen superstitions. They had to build bridges across the yawning gulfs that separated Jew from Gentile, bond from free, male from female. Their task was to turn the world upside down, because it was wrongside up. It should be noticed that the programme of Christ was concerned 'with the agenda rather than the credenda of the faith.' 'Go ye and teach them to *observe all things* whatsoever I have commanded you.' It was with the world's manner of life rather than with its views that the disciples primarily must concern themselves. And every one knows that it is an infinitely harder task to change men's lives than to alter their ideas. Yet that was the task Christ set them to do, and for this superhuman undertaking they were furnished with no resources except such as the Presence yielded.

The testimony of the Early Church was that those resources were adequate. Dr. Gossip tells that when the British soldiers landed in France at the beginning of the Great War, they went through villages and townships of France shouting 'Hip, hip, Hurrah.' The natives optimistically understood them to say, 'Il pourra.' 'He will see it through.' That may be a legend, but this is no legend that the Early Church marched, with banners flying, to the strain of that music.

One is impressed in the New Testament with the total absence of the word 'problem.' The Early Church was blind to its problems, because its eyes were dazzled with the splendour of its resources. To be sure these Christians had problems and to spare, but they pitted their own resourcelessness against their divine resources, and they were well content to leave the matter there. Nothing can be more impressive than the sense of adequacy and even of opulence which marked all their lives. They were sitting on the top of things, and the world was at their feet, 'I have a sufficiency of all things,' said one of them. 'In Christ Jesus I have all things and abound.' 'In Him who strengtheneth me I am equal to anything.' The Presence brought to them the fullness of God, and what more could they need or want?

Do we not need to recover this Apostolic accent in the life of the modern Church? Our Church consciousness to-day is clouded over with the problem-complex. We are beset by problems: the problems of the faith, of Church life, of the social order, of the international order. It is a bewildering chaos. And to our Christian life the same criticism applies. We are more acutely conscious of our loneliness than of the presence of the Divine Companion. We stress our perplexities, and forget our Guide. We are overwhelmed with our sufferings, and fail to catch the gentle accents of the Comforter Divine. We groan under our responsibilities, and the burden of our tasks, and ignore the presence of the Strengtheners. We see the bane, but we are blind to the antidote. We emphasize our poverty, we forget our riches. We know our task, we are ignorant of our resources. Religion is to us, what it should never be, weights; instead of being, what it should be, wings. Our sorest need is to recover the Apostolic emphasis.

When Charles VIII. demanded ransom of the city of Florence, the Mayor, Capponi, refused to give a groat. Charles thundered threats. 'I will have my trumpets blown!' he shouted, with gleaming eyes. 'Blow your trumpets,' replied Capponi, 'Blow your trumpets and we will ring our bells.' At this threat Charles was silent, for he knew that at the ringing of the bells the hidden armies of Florence would spring into action.

Is the time not overdue for the Church to cease concentrating on its problems and to begin to possess and enjoy and use its resources? For the simple truth is, that faith in the Risen and ever present Christ puts at our disposal all the invisible and invincible legions of heaven.¹

¹ R. Menzies, *The Magnet of the Heart*, 189.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Subduing Cynicism.

BY THE REVEREND LEIGH WALLER, B.A.,
BRIDGWATER.

'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs.—Mt 7^a.

This saying stands somewhat disjointedly in the setting of the Sermon on the Mount; we cannot, without undue strain, weave it into its immediate context. Matthew is the only writer who records it.

Yet it is certainly congruous with the attitude of Jesus. We must be struck by the reverent spirit of His living. Not only does He show it in the attachment He had for the synagogue, attending its worship each Sabbath, and in a love of the Temple that made him go to the audacious extreme of driving out the money-changers from its precincts, but there is an attitude of reverence pervading His life. It was due to His discernment of the presence and care of God, the Father. This characteristic reverence was an awareness of God's power; to Him the world was alive with the Father's presence.

Jesus trained His disciples in the same attitude. The closer relationship between man and God that He taught enriched the meaning of the sacred moments in life. At the same time, of course, it increased responsibility for preserving what was sacred. No longer was the sense of the holy, the experience of life's most intimate contacts with God to be mediated by a privileged priesthood. The Holy of Holies was thrown open, though not to the inquisitive and the irreligious, to all reverently minded disciples.

Formerly the priesthood was the sole custodian of holy things; it watched over and preserved the sacred temple properties and also the sacred occasions of worship. Religion belonged to a group rather than to individuals; the priesthood dealt in holy things as representative of the group. Even for Ezekiel, who seems more prophet than priest and who suggests an understanding of personal religion, the ideal state that Israel may become includes a priesthood to 'teach my people the difference between the holy and the common.'

Jesus broadens the vision and makes every follower a custodian of the mysteries of religion. He teaches a high view of life; a lofty responsibility for reverence.

At the heart of all religion, we are told, there is a core of wonder, a sense of mystery, an idea of the holy. It is present no less in personal than in priestly religion. Jesus makes His followers responsible for

maintaining an attitude of reverence and for opposing the shallow view that sees life as something sordid.

Life goes on a dreary way for a time, and then suddenly there is a divine uplifting of the commonplace, a crowded moment of experience from which all that is ugly, untrue, or immoral is purged. There are treasurable times in life, sacred with a vision of God.

I am a little child, and I
Am ignorant and weak;
I gaze into the starry sky
And then I cannot speak;

For all behind the starry sky,
Behind the world so broad,
Behind men's hearts and souls doth lie
The infinite of God.

There are moments when we discern the infinite of God. They may be moments in prayer; in church worship or private devotion; they may be moments when even in the presence of pain and bitterness we feel the finger of God on our lives. Perhaps the time comes when we are facing the loveliness of natural beauty, or in personal relationships: the presence of children, the conversation of friends. There is a rich variety of holy occasions.

'Mysticism,' says the critic. Yes, but such mysticism is justified if the experience and knowledge of what is holy is not confined to the appreciation of beauty. Through beauty alone we may be carried away into inexplicable ecstasy and yet not know God in the experience. Yet surely we may be allowed to interpret beauty as a thing divine if in parallel experiences of moral and spiritual awakening we hear God's voice?

If some Word of the Lord comes to us, rousing thought, feeling, and will to loftiest heights, then we must attempt to apply it by a constant reinterpretation of life in the highest terms. Once life has been spiritually quickened by contact with God there is no longer room for the mean or ignoble outlook.

We shall discover, however, that there is a prevalent irreligion that belittles the sense of the holy. Life is hard and the world is cruel, we shall be told. Worse still, the character of life has been unmasked and there is no room for reverence. That is the viewpoint of the cynic.

Our text has direct application to present-day cynicism. The word 'cynic,' too, has a peculiar appropriateness in view of its origin. If the first cynics did not object to the epithet 'dog,' it was

because they wished to emphasize the necessity of simplicity in life. They were not disbelievers in virtues. But the contemporary cynic has acquired other characteristics of the dog. He growls at life. The modern cynic sneers at idealism; he has no sense of the holy; he is out of patience with goodness. He takes up the standpoint that having discovered the worst about life he can never believe in the best. In fact, he would say, there is no best. The cynic loves the seamy side.

We are all tainted with cynicism to-day, thinks Gerald Heard. 'We believe in the collapse of the best, but never in the conversion, salvation of the worst.' And Dr. Inge, reviewing literature of to-day, comments on the complete absence of that type of character which commands our respect. Of even the greatest writers of the time he says: 'Most of them write as though there were no such thing as religion, or high-minded idealism.' Discussing a recent by-election, the *Manchester Guardian* asked how many men there were in the House of Commons who stood as vividly for anything as a certain candidate named did for the Puritan way of life. 'Not half a dozen,' it concluded, 'Probably not more than one—Mr. George Lansbury. Indeed the trouble with this House is that so few people in it seem to be standing for anything at all.'

Both literature and politics are badly tarred with cynicism. Is religion to suffer the same treatment? Is it to fall into the hands of cynics and have an injection of their poison? Are the cynics to be the acknowledged interpreters of life?

'Give not that which is holy unto the dogs,' may well be applied to our age to mean: Do not

let the cynics interpret life and religion in their own terms. We must enter combat to-day where the challenge is fiercest—with cynicism. And though we may be fighting with weapons unknown to the cynic, we have secret armaments of idealism, kindness, long-suffering with which we can replenish ourselves in hours of devotion. Then out to the fight with those whose faith is gone, with those for whom there is no 'hitching a waggon to a star,' because the waggon is stuck deep in the mud, and their attention is on the mud so that they see no star.

Lest this seems another call for optimism in a world that so often appears to betray the optimist, lest it seem idle dreaming in a world of sternest realities, let us remind ourselves of how Christianity began as a world force. It was when there was little room for empty idealism. It began when men had dared to face life's greatest tragedy: the crucifixion of the noblest they knew. Idealism there may have been in plenty as the disciples tramped about Palestine with their master, but the world mission began after that idealism had gone through the gloomy experience of the judgment and death of Jesus.

Christianity offers an idealism that has faced a crucifixion. Just as Jesus 'knew what was in men,' knew how often they betrayed the best, so Christians have seen in the Cross the terrible worst of sin, cruelty, and hatred, yet dare to believe that the best is possible. This is because they see the Cross as a demonstration of the power of God's love. They can face life with courage and optimism because they have seen an undefeated, undefeatable love.

Intercession and its Objectives.

BY STEPHEN HOBHOUSE, M.A., BROXBOURNE, HERTS.

IN Great Britain and, I suppose, in most Christian countries under a monarchical form of government, special prayers are offered up regularly Sunday after Sunday in the majority of churches for the King and the heir to the Crown. The sins and failings of monarchs are, notoriously, often of the most unmistakable kind. Too frequently, as we know, they succumb to the peculiar temptations which surround the throne. This consideration makes it *prima facie* reasonable to question the

value of the prayers, however earnest and sincere, made continually on their behalf, and how far they can be expected to help in the way desired by right-minded worshippers. To discuss the wider implications of this problem is the purpose of this essay. As a point of departure I will take a seemingly decisive case of the futility of much praying, namely, that provided by the history of our English George IV.

From the very hour almost of his birth in 1762,

through nearly sixty years as Prince of Wales and as Regent, George was the object of daily or weekly intercessions, in Anglican churches particularly. Some portion of the intense earnestness in praying that characterized the Methodist and Evangelical revivals, which synchronized with Prince George's rising manhood, must certainly have found its way into numberless prayers on his behalf. The character of the best of these prayers may perhaps be judged from an address presented to his royal father after the young George's birth by the Quaker community, in which the hope was expressed that 'formed to piety and virtue he may live beloved of God and man' and may fill the British throne with lustre. Inasmuch as all this praying for him by name started from his very birth and went on while his character was in the mould, it should have had an excellent opportunity for taking effect. In the event, George IV. became, by general consent, an exceptionally worthless type of individual—selfish, deceitful, and malicious over and above his abnormal sexual irregularities.

Undoubtedly we have here a problem which, if properly faced up to, must leave the average believing Christian bewildered and baffled. Are public prayers for those set in authority completely futile? If so, ought they not to be discontinued? Does the apparent failure of our prayers here provide a test case which invalidates all intercessory prayer? If in other fields the good influence of intercession upon individuals appears to be abundantly proved, what lessons can be learnt from failure here?

It must of course be allowed that a great mass of the prayers for royal personages are bound to be merely formal and official and therefore presumably of no avail in the sight of God. In a monarchical State, nominally Christian, particularly one with an established Church, they are regarded as part of the machinery of government for the promotion of good citizenship. They emphasize and inculcate loyalty, patriotism, and respect for the social structure, so largely dominated by aristocracy or wealth. As doing this, prayers for royalty are justified and advocated by many people who have no belief in a God who listens to prayer. And even in the hearts of those who do so believe, intercessions for the representatives of the nation may be little or no more than the expressions of corporate selfishness, the desire that our community should prosper at the expense of other communities. And such prayers, which are by no means made in the name, that is, in the spirit of Jesus, are no more likely to be answered by God

than selfish prayers uttered by the individual on his own behalf or on that of his family, regardless of the needs and well-being of others. It is curiously significant of the importance (partly, I am afraid, due to social snobbery) that is attributed to the Crown in this country that no special prayers for the Prime Minister as an individual are prescribed, although the fortunes of our nation depend far more upon his wisdom and integrity than upon the qualities of the Monarch.

Making all allowances, however, it is reasonably certain, as I have already indicated, that a great amount of earnest and unselfish prayer has been directed towards the Royal Family. Many good men and women regard it as a sacred duty to pray for the King and his heir. Why have their prayers, at least in these test instances, been unanswered?

Another extreme type of unanswered intercession may perhaps throw light upon the problem. Many who have made irretrievable moral shipwreck in this life have been the offspring of parents, of whom one or both have been passionately devoted to them and earnest before God in prayer on their behalf from the day of their birth and before. St. Augustine, it is true, accepted the Bishop's assurance to his mother, and maintained that it was not possible for the son of many tears and prayers to perish. Unfortunately this is disproved by the record of many a sad career, though beyond the grave such prayers may well avail.

There is a passage at the end of the Epistle of St. John, in which the writer speaks of those who have committed a 'sin unto death,' saying that he does not enjoin any one to offer prayer on their behalf. However wrong it be to accept this as a definite prohibition of prayer for the worst sinners, yet it suggests that the effectiveness—for this life—of such prayer is very problematic. Here, perhaps, we have a hint for the solution of our difficulty.

God has endowed men with a large measure of His own free will, and being unwilling, perhaps we may say unable, to bring fallen men back into harmony with Himself without the full consent of that free will, He allows men to persist for an indefinite period in ways of life that bring disaster and misery, while they resist the heavenly streams of love and mercy that are ever being directed towards them. In these beneficent streams our intercessions find their natural place, and it is just the independence of human wills, when sufficiently self-centred and rebellious against divine law, which makes them unavailing. There is always therefore a possibility, amounting in cases where

the evil will has become, at least temporarily, rigid, to a probability, that in any particular case our prayers will have little or no effect. The mass of obstinate ill-will is, for the time, too opaque for the healing rays of love.

In considering the choice of objects for our prayers it is certainly right in exceptional cases to trust to the guidance of a strong leading or moving of the spirit without supporting arguments. But as a rule reason and experience suggest that they should be directed towards those persons and groups where the conditions are present that will be likely to give an entrance to their influence. This will not be the case where the will of a person appears to be inflexibly set in a course of wrong action, while at the same time external circumstances, especially when embodied in an imposing institution or organization, are such as to contribute to the success of that course. In so far therefore as the shackles of wealth and adulation, of false ceremonial and social custom, bind a king (or still more a dictator) and tend to dry up the flow of human sympathy and humility, it is very doubtful whether prayers for him can be recommended with due economy of effort—except indeed in any case where a strong impulse to pray impresses itself upon the heart as a word direct from God.

I would also suggest that our intercession is unlikely to reach its desired objective unless two factors are present in the mind and heart of the intercessor: first, some considerable knowledge of the character and circumstances of the persons prayed for, preferably at first hand or else in reliance on good first-hand authorities; and along with this a deep and genuine love or at least imaginative sympathy for those persons, not merely a formal sense of duty or a conviction that our own welfare is bound up with their activities, as when men pray passionately in time of war for the general who is most likely to destroy their enemies.

Intercession lists are often printed asking the reader to pray, perhaps on successive days, for particular countries or places and the work of Christian bodies therein; or again, we are invited to pray for particular sick people who are quite unknown to us. In the absence in each case of at least some degree of special knowledge of and sympathetic interest for the objects represented by such names, there seems to be but little reason to think that our prayers, however charged with a fund of sincere undefined feeling, will reach their geographical or personal objective. The same thing applies in the case of many people to prayers

for King, Parliament, Church, and so on, used in public and private worship.

It is impossible indeed to assign any value to a prayer which lacks some basis, however small, of unselfish affection or interest. But in the case of prayers, which, having this affection-basis, are nevertheless most unlikely to reach their particular objective, owing either to an insufficiency of knowledge and understanding on the part of the petitioner or to an excess of perversity and unfavourable environment on the part of the person prayed for—it would be quite wrong to suppose that such prayers are wasted and without value for God and man.

In Longfellow's poem of *Evangeline* the priest says to the woman who was searching vainly for her lost lover:

Talk not of wasted affection; affection never was
wasted;
If it enrich not the heart of another, its waters, re-
turning
Back to their springs, like the rain, shall fill them full
of refreshment;
That which the fountain sends forth returns again to
the fountain.

This rightly suggests that he who truly prays, like him who truly loves, will himself benefit from his efforts, however directly frustrated. But the reality seems to include much more than this; all true prayer that for one reason or another misses its intended object flows into a mighty reservoir, the ocean of God's love, and contributes to swell those outflowing streams, which soften or refresh with drops of blessing all hearts in any degree open to Him. Or, to change the metaphor, we might say that such a prayer is like a light-ray that, meeting with an excessive opaqueness in its direct object, glances off and sheds its healing beams upon other objects adjoining.

In the *Cloud of Unknowing*, one of the earliest and greatest books of mystical religion in the English language, written to instruct learners in the high art of the adoration of God by contemplative prayer, we are told that a pure 'stirring of love unto God for Himself,' excluding all thought of any person or thing whatsoever, 'is more profitable to the health of thy soul, more worthy in itself, and more pleasing to God and to all the saints and angels in heaven—yea! and more helpful to all thy friends, bodily and ghostly, quick and dead,' than the highest and holiest of other activities conceivable. Just as Christ on the Cross offered Himself up in the veriest sacrifice generally and in common for all, so one who sacrifices himself

perfectly in contemplative prayer 'knits all men to God as effectually as himself is knit. And more charity may no man do than thus to sacrifice himself for all his brethren and sisters in grace and nature.' The same old writer says that in ordinary intercession a man may direct his prayer 'to his friend or to his foe, to his kin or his stranger—yea! and sometimes more to his foe than to his friend,' and may express in it his more familiar affection to one, two, or three, just as 'Christ felt such a familiar affection to John and to Mary and to Peter before many others'; but in the highest form of prayer, that is, contemplation, 'in the time of this work shall all be equally dear to him, for he shall feel then no other cause but only God. . . . Whoso will be a perfect disciple of our Lord's, he must strain up in his spirit in this ghostly work for the salvation of all his brethren and sisters in nature, as our Lord did His body on the Cross; not only for his friends and his kin and his dear lovers, but generally for all mankind.'

So, too, in harmony with this teaching, a modern Carmelite nun (as reported by Dom Cuthbert Butler in his *Western Mysticism*), long practised in intercessions for the souls of men, tells us how for years she wrestled with dryness of spirit and with varying distractions of thought and feeling, until at last there came a time when she would suddenly find herself united with God, in a condition approaching ecstasy, and could do nothing but repeat the words, 'My God, I love Thee,' and this simple prayer seemed better than to plead for souls, for it included them all.

These expressions of the century-old Catholic tradition indicate the oneness of all petitionary prayer and suggest that its canalization towards any particular human beings is not of primary importance. If our praying is akin to God's nature, He can be trusted to use it in the particular direction where it will be fruitful. At the same time definiteness of object is often useful to prevent prayer degenerating into vague and shallow sentiment; and it is indeed often the inevitable outcome of the heart's loving impulse. For in so far as our hearts are touched by the needs of our fellows, kindred or stranger, friend or foe, they, more than but not excluding our heads, are the best guide to the direction of our prayers; while we may encourage ourselves with the certainty that, in so far as our prayer is sincere, however little it may be able to help its immediate object, yet somewhere or other it will reach a soul who will be stirred by its touch to the winning of a more abundant life in God.

This article has not by a long way fully answered the questions posed on an earlier page. But it has, I hope, suggested why, if we use specific intercession for persons—for those set in authority in particular—we must not, when our intercessions appear to have no influence for good, lose faith in their value, even though we may feel it right to modify or vary them, as heart and head, under God's guidance, may from time to time prompt us.

Much of what is written above will apply also to praying in regard to conditions of society and to social or religious movements, so far as they can be distinguished from the persons involved in them. We may pray for international peace or for social justice or some great reform—for anything that can be comprehended in the coming of God's Kingdom on earth; intercession for such causes may be heart-felt, well-informed, and widespread, and yet may appear for the time being at least to have been completely ineffectual; indeed, reaction instead of progress may seem to be registered. The reason will be in the main because the evils attacked by our prayers are so virulent, so strongly entrenched in the hearts of men and in the organization of vested interests that all our active goodwill is unavailing to dissipate them; possibly, too, because men of goodwill, including ourselves, are not yet prepared to give up reliance upon such things as private wealth, national armaments, and other material supports in exchange for that perfect confidence in God which is the only true security for justice and peace. But in these fields also we may be sure that no true prayer made in the name or spirit of Jesus is ever really wasted. If, for instance, many of us have been praying long and earnestly for international peace, and yet the catastrophe of another world-war comes because the many evil forces making for war have been too strong for the forces (including our prayers) making for peace, yet every fragment of our efforts will be treasured up in God's storehouse, in readiness for the day when the flames of war will have died down and the task of building up a new and more Christlike civilization out of the ruins of the present ill-founded order is renewed once more.

Hartley Coleridge's sonnet on prayer is not poetry of a high order, but it gets near the heart of the matter:

Pray in the darkness if there be no light.

Far is the time, remote from human sight,

When war and discord on the earth shall cease:

Yet every prayer for universal peace

Avails the blessed time to expedite.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Life and Work Conference.

No representative of the Evangelical Church of Germany was present at Oxford owing to the action of the Government. But there had been preparation for the Conference, the subject of which is of so vital interest to that country—Church, Community, and State. This volume of essays is the result.¹ The Introduction is by Bishop Theodor Heckel, the head of what may be described as the officially recognized Church's department for œcumenic affairs. The volume does not contain anything critical of the Government, and a good deal laudatory of it. Some articles may be described as neutral in the Church dispute, but many of them are, more or less openly, propaganda for National Socialism. Lutheran theology offers a basis for the apology, Church and State are sharply separated; the authority of the State is asserted. The Nazi revolution is welcomed as a deliverance from the humiliation, exasperation, and desperation to which the nation had been provoked by the Peace Treaty, and the subsequent treatment by the victorious allies. It is prized as a recovery of the German soul from enslavement to ideas foreign to it. Not only Communism but even Liberalism are denounced. It is even indicated that only by the rigid discipline of the Totalitarian State and the subordination of the individual to the community could such an emancipation be effected. The dark shadows are ignored; Germany appears in the sunshine of security, prosperity, and progress. Anglo-American theory and practice come in for severe depreciation. We must assume that all the writers are expressing their sincere convictions and are not writing to order. If so, the outlook for international and inter-church mutual understanding and conciliation is dark indeed. The German nationalism, which is so threatening to the peace of Europe, is here confidently justified by what to the writers appears incontrovertible reasoning, but to many a reader will seem rather 'rationalization.' One paragraph in the last article dealing with the *Innere Mission* may be quoted as typical. 'A new, powerful government, conscious of its might as of its responsibility has, aware of its aim, entered into the conflict against the needs of the people. A people (*Volk*), awakened to new life, has won a fully new form,

has placed itself in all regions of life on a new foundation, has given to all living relations a new ground and a new aim. Germany through Adolf Hitler has experienced, not only a change of its circumstances, but a fully new character' (p. 309).

This collection of essays on one of the most (if not the most) critical issues of the hour, the relation of Church and State, was issued by the Universal Council of Christian Life and Work, the continuation of the Stockholm Conference, in preparation for the Oxford Conference, the subject of which was the Church, Community, and State.² While the title *Totalitarian State and Christian Freedom*, suggests a restriction of interest, yet inevitably the general reference cannot be excluded. Although the whole volume is in German, there are English, French, and Russian contributors. The first essay, by Alexejev, deals with 'Society, State, and Church,' and the eighth, by W. Paton, treats the special subject from the standpoint of the mission field. While there is variation in the titles of the other essays, they all handle the same issue though from varying standpoints—Reformed, Lutheran, Anglican, and Orthodox. Detailed discussion cannot be attempted, but some general impressions may be offered.

The Totalitarian State, though in theory it claims authority over the *total* thought and life of the subjects of the State may not in practice assert that authority, but leave a restricted freedom in certain spheres; it claims to be the sole judge of any temporary or permanent restrictions which in its own interest it may impose. Again the Totalitarian State bases its claim on its being the expression of the life of the people (*Volk*): it can execute the national will more effectively than the democratic system could. These qualifications of an adverse judgment some of the German writers make. As regards liberty a distinction is made between Christian liberty and Church liberty on the one hand and personal liberty on the other. No man can take away Christian liberty, the freedom wherewith Christ makes free from sin, law, and death; here no dungeon can make a prison. The Church's liberty to fulfil its mission and deliver its message and thus the Christian's exercise of that liberty, in outward witness or work, may, however, be prevented, or punished, and thus restricted.

² *Totaler Staat und christliche Freiheit*, 1937. Forschungsabteilung des Ökumenischen Rates für Praktisches Christentum (Geneva, 41 Avenue de Champel).

¹ *Kirche, Volk und Staat*, herausgegeben von Lic. Eugen Gerstenmaier, (Furche Verlag, Berlin, 1937).

In the last essay, Wendland in his title distinguishes *Christian and creaturely liberty*, the freedom for self-realization which man as a creature of God can claim according to the divine intention in creating. This distinction Lutheranism tends to emphasize more than do the Reformed churches, which are less marked by the dualism between Christian life and life generally. Can we, however, so separate Creation and Redemption? If man be one surely his Christian liberty is restricted if his creaturely is. Some of the writers who make the distinction do recognize that the Church should concern itself about the liberty of man as created by God, and not only its own liberty. The Confessional Synod has here shown a restriction of interest, which somewhat lessens its general appeal. Universal human as well as distinctive Christian interests are in jeopardy.

This ¹ is another of the volumes, issued to provide material for the discussions at the Oxford Conference of the Life and Work Council on the subject of Church, Community, and State. This volume has a peculiar interest as representing Russian Orthodoxy. Whether the articles were all written in German, or translated, the volume has the merit of a lucidity of style, which German writings often lack; and the first five articles have an obvious relevance to the subject of the discussion at the Conference. The first article on the 'Russian People and the State,' by N. Alexejev, gives an interesting historical review of Russian views of the relation of Church and State, and shows that the theory of the necessary connexion of orthodoxy and Czardom has not been the only one, as is often assumed. G. Fedotov is equally interesting in discussing 'The Kingdom of God and History.' A. Kastaschou hampers his discussion of the relation of 'The

¹ *Kirche, Staat und Mensch. Russisch-orthodoxe Studien.* Forschungsabteilung des Oekumenischen Rates für Praktisches Christentum (Geneva, 41 Avenue de Champel).

Church to the State' by the analogy of Soul and Body, and even by applying to it the Chalcedonian formula of the two natures in the one Person of Christ. Of immediate relevance is B. Vyscheslavzev's comparison of 'Marxism, Communism, and the Totalitarian State.' A transition to the second part of the volume, which deals with Man, is A. Alexejev's 'Marxist Anthropology.' N. Berdjajev offers a contribution to a Christian anthropology, which shows some independent thinking on 'The Problem of Man.' The next writer, S. Bulgakov, extends his treatment of 'Christian Anthropology' to include some fantastic speculation about the divine and the earthly *sophia*, and a plea, based on that speculation, for what in my judgment is superstitious Mariolatry. The editor would have exercised a wise discretion in insisting on the relevance of the contents to the subject of the title. F. Lieb reproduces an article on 'The Anthropology of Dostojewskij,' intensely interesting as showing the vivid interest of a great novelist in man's sin and salvation. B. Vyscheslavzev has two articles dealing with 'The Image of God' as affected by the Fall and as belonging to the nature of man; and W. Zenkowsky covers much the same ground in treating 'The Evil in Man.' Here the orthodox doctrine is expounded and compared with the Roman Catholic and the Protestant. A more serious view of the consequences of the Fall is taken than by Roman Catholicism, but a less rigid than by traditional Protestantism. The divine image has been affected, but not destroyed. The Barthian exaggerations get some hard knocks. While agreeing generally with the conception of man and his value here presented, the insistence on man's divinity and deification does not commend itself to my monotheism; the ethical emphasis is supplanted by the ontological, and the writers seem quite unaware that their dogmatic assumptions are antiquated in modern Christian thinking.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

Contributions and Comments.

A Prophet in his own Country (In. iv. 44).

THE explanations of St. John's application of this saying are far-fetched. Everything is made plain by a transposition of v.⁴⁵. Thus:

⁴³. But after the two days he went out thence into Galilee.

[⁴⁵]. He went therefore again into Cana of Galilee where he made the water wine.

⁴⁴. For Jesus himself testified that a prophet in his own country hath no honour.

⁴⁵. When therefore he went into Galilee the Galileans received him, having seen . . . feast.

⁴⁶. Now there was a certain nobleman. . . .

This brings the quotation into line with its use in the Synoptists, and indeed assumes familiarity with it. He went (not to Nazareth, but) to Cana. The recurrence of *ἦλθεν, εἰς τὴν καὶ Γαλιλαία* readily accounts for an accidental omission of what now appears as part of v.⁴⁶ and subsequent insertion in the wrong place. W. A. WORDSWORTH.

Hindhead, Surrey.

St. Mark vi. 20.

καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἦκουε.

Should we read *πολλὰ ἠπόρει*, or *πολλὰ ἐποίει*?

THE relationship between Antipas and John the Baptist and the mental action and reaction of one upon the other provide a problem of much interest to the psychologist. It is not, however, as such that approach is here made to St. Mark's narrative, though the psychological aspect can scarcely be excluded altogether. Few readings adopted by the Revisers of 1881 have given rise to so much difference of opinion as that of *ἠπόρει* for *ἐποίει* in the above passage, and this applies to textual critics and commentators.

It is to be noted at the outset that, whilst the R.V. adopts *ἠπόρει* in the text, it has the marginal note 'many ancient authorities read *did many things*.' This implies that the difference of reading was judged to be of such importance as to require a particular notice. The principle on which the Revisers acted is also to be noted; their Preface to the N.T. says: 'The rendering in the text, where it agrees with the Authorised Version, was supported by at least one-third, and, where it differs from the Authorised Version, by at least two-thirds of those who were present at the second revision of the passage in question.'

The manuscript authority for each of the above readings may be stated thus: For *πολλὰ ἠπόρει*, \aleph BL Codex Washingtoniensis (W); Codex Koridethianus Θ , Memphitic. For *πολλὰ ἐποίει*, ACD Δ ΠΣ. Lat. and Syr. vss. No doubt the influence of Westcott and Hort went far towards the adoption of *ἠπόρει* by the majority of the Revisers; their preference for readings supported by \aleph and B is here and elsewhere evident. Fifty years ago, as Sir Frederic Kenyon points out, it seemed as if Westcott and Hort had found 'a royal road to the recovery of the original text of the New Testament,' and that 'we should depart from the Codex Vaticanus

(except in the case of obvious scribal blunders) at our peril' (*The Story of the Bible*, 143). The swing of the pendulum seems now to be in a different direction. But this is a matter for the experts.

Turning to comparatively recent commentators on the above passage we find three of the leading ones adopting the reading *ἠπόρει*—Swete, Bruce in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, and, later, Turner in *A New Testament Commentary on Holy Scripture*. Turner lays stress on the fact that Codex Washingtoniensis and Codex Koridethianus reinforce the reading of the three MSS of one group, representing as they do a different type of text.

Two works on textual criticism may now be referred to. Dr. Scrivener in the 1st and 2nd editions of his *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* decides in favour of *ἠπόρει*. 'We do not hesitate,' he says, 'to receive a variation supported by only a few first-rate authorities, where internal evidence pleads so powerfully in its favour.' In the 3rd edition of his work he retracts that opinion, 'for the former reading (*ἐποίει*) now appears to me to afford an excellent sense. Herod gladly heard the Baptist and *did many things* at his exhortation; everything, in fact, save the one great sacrifice which he could not persuade himself to make' (pp. 581, 582).

When discussing the passage, Nestle decides in favour of *ἠπόρει*, but adds that Field and Burkitt are in favour of *ἐποίει* (*Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament*, translated by Edie, p. 264). Field's influence on the work of the Revisers—though he was not present at their meetings—is touchingly referred to in 'Notes of Recent Exposition' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of August 1899. We may bring this symposium to a close by quoting a portion of the learned author of *Otium Norvicense* when dealing with the passage: 'When Demosthenes says of a certain King who was threatened with hostilities by a neighbouring power, *πρέσβεις πέμπων ἈΠΑΝΤΑ ποιεῖν ἔτοιμος ἦν*, we understand this of an unconditional surrender on the part of the sender of the embassy. But suppose the message had been *ΠΟΛΛΑ ποιεῖν ἔτοιμος ἦν*, would not the alteration imply that there was something reserved, some concession that he was unwilling to make.' It is easy to perceive how this applies to Herod, and his relation to the Baptist, as his spiritual adviser. The remark is as old as Elsner *ad loc.* '*πολλὰ ἐποίει*, at non primarium illud quod Joannes urserat: *fratris uxorem non dimisit*.' If *ἠπόρει* is (as we think) a *correction*, it is an easy matter to trace the origin of it. Herod 'was much perplexed (*διηπόρει*) on another occasion (Luke

ix. 7), though still in connexion with the Baptist. His perplexity in regard to the claims of Jesus was not unnaturally transferred to those of his forerunner' (*Notes on the Translation of the New Testament* [1899] 29, 30).

CHARLES A. WEBSTER.

Bandon, Co. Cork.

Scripture Quotations in the Pastoral Epistles.

A POINT that is perhaps worth adding to Dr. P. N. Harrison's exhaustive analysis of the language of the Pastoral Epistles is the comparatively small use that these Epistles make of Scripture quotations. Counting the quotations in black type in the ordinary Nestle edition, and trying not to recount repetitions in the context, we find two in 1 Ti (5^{18, 19}), four in 2 Ti (two in 2¹⁹, one each in 4¹⁴ and 4¹⁷, both of which are genuine notes), and one in Tit (2¹⁴). This makes seven in eighteen pages, or an average of 0.39 per page.

The comparative figures for the genuine Pauline Epistles are :

	Quotations.	Pages.	Average per Page.
Romans 1-8 . . .	19	17	1.12
Romans 9-16 . . .	45	16	2.81

(I have thought it fairer to quote the second half of Romans separately, as chapters 9-11 form rather a special case.)

	Quotations.	Pages.	Average per Page.
1 Corinthians . . .	29	32	0.9
2 Corinthians . . .	19	21	0.9
Galatians . . .	13	10	1.3
Ephesians . . .	17	11	1.54
Philippians . . .	6	8	0.75
Colossians . . .	4	8	0.5
1 Thessalonians . . .	7	7	1.0
2 Thessalonians . . .	8	4	2.0
Philemon . . .	0	2	0.0
Total . . .	167	136	1.23

Philemon may fairly be omitted. The subject-matter of the second half of Romans and of 2 Thessalonians makes their level of quotations rather high. The others, with the exception of Colossians, show a pretty fair standard of consistency, ranging from twice the proportion found in the Pastoral Epistles to four times the proportion, with an average of just over three times. There does not appear to be any reason in the subject-matter of the Pastoral Epistles for the deficiency.

H. K. MOULTON.

*United Theological College,
Bangalore.*

Entre Nous.

In the Steps of Moses.

One morning, Mr. Louis Golding, the well-known author of 'Magnolia Street,' was asked over the telephone, 'Will you go to the East this year and follow in the steps of Moses the Law-Giver?' The result of this invitation is the vivid book which has now been published by Messrs. Rich & Cowan (7s. 6d. net). In it Mr. Golding does not tell the whole tale of Moses, but carries it to Mount Sinai where the Lord spake on the top of the mountain and uttered the Ten Words, 'which words are the most familiar to modern ears in our modern world, at least, saving only those other later words known as the Lord's Prayer.' The story is to be carried to its finale on Mount Pisgah in the book which is to follow, 'In the Steps of Moses the Conqueror.'

In his introduction Mr. Golding forestalls our criticism and warns his readers not to read on if

they want original ideas, for he and his two companions are going to follow the tradition. 'It was the tradition that most interested us. We feel the tradition's as likely to be true as anything that can be found out at this date. And, in any case, it has a real truth of its own, just because it is the tradition. . . . "And you see, sir," Lucas helped me out. "We went through the alternative routes. And they're all comparatively dull. The traditional route is so beautiful and so exciting."'

So Mr. Golding and his two companions, their motor cars, and drivers, are ready to start off. But where are they to go first? What is the site of that spot where Moses was found by Pharaoh's daughter? They decide on Roda Island in Cairo. But do not take this identification too seriously, the author hastens to add, for it has not even any persistent tradition to back it. Then a picture of the veiled years is built up and the framework filled

in with stories from the Talmud and Josephus. From Memphis (the capital of Rameses II. who is accepted as the Pharaoh of the Oppression) the journey continues to Heliopolis, where Moses would go 'to study under the best masters.' But the bulk of the book is concerned with the Exodus and the stages of the journey, and again Mr. Golding and his companions question themselves as to where was then this place and where was the other. Or whether the identifications are right or wrong. The reader meantime enjoys the descriptions and admires the photographs.

'Tayibeh contracted into a narrow defile, when the darkness hung back in the grottoes like lurking beasts. The blue thrust of the sea came out upon us suddenly, one blue, and another blue, and another, a whole sea in exquisite damascene of blue. Then, the moment we emerged, the substance of colour changed. It ceased to be compact like stone or metal. It became veined like flowers or leaves. Beyond, on the right hand, the hills of Africa defiled southward, in a shimmer of pink and lilac and royal purple, washed in the rose-water of the winter sunset. On the left hand the promontory of Abu Zenima defined the bay, with a gesture of arrest; so that the mind announced to itself: that is a good thing. Could the egg-shell stuff of the old skull endure much more? Or at the next onslaught of white-peony cloud and pink-daisy wave edges and primrose hill would the poor thing cave in?

'So we removed from Elim and encamped by the Red Sea.'

And so at last they came to the Convent at the foot of Mount Sinai, where Mr. Golding admits rather ruefully that, 'Moses is harder to see than he was in the first centuries,' and where he finds that the relics of St. Catherine rather than the relics of Moses are the chief pride.

It is well to remember—for how seemly it is—that the Louis Golding writing about the Holy Mount was once the little Jewish boy listening in a kitchen in Doomington to his father reading from the Holy Books.

"The Mountain?" I cried, from the metal stool where I sat. "What is the name of that Mountain, father?"

"Hush! hush!" whispered my mother and my sisters faintly. A slight strain constricted the atmosphere. It was not considered seemly for any one, least of all one of the younger members of the family, to let his voice be heard when my father was reading from the books, and expounding them.

But he was in no unamiable mood that evening. "Let him ask! What was it you were asking, son?"

"I was asking the name of that Mountain? The one which Moses climbed to look down on the companies."

"It is called Horeb, or Mount Sinai, the Holy Mountain. Why do you ask, son?"

"Because I have been there! I, too, have climbed it!"

The smile faded from his eyes. He looked at me in silence for twenty seconds, then turned his head slowly back toward his book.

My mouth quivered. The tears started in my eyes. "Perhaps I did not, father! Perhaps I did not!"

It is in the last chapter that the reader feels most strongly the spiritual quality of the book. 'I will not make words, I told myself, regarding the view from Gebel Musa . . . for the Holy Mountain is a spiritual, not a physical experience. Few men have ever reached the summit, and few will get there again. . . . The ascent is hopeless if neither behind nor before your eyes the thunder crashes and the lightning flares. Perhaps it is only when the Mountain is veiled round with impenetrable cloud, that the Mountain begins to be visible at all.'

Manna?

In the Wadi Feiran, in the manna country, Mr. Golding met a Greek monk with some Bedouin servants. Where did that manna come from which they gathered at certain seasons, he asked them. 'It is from the Lord,' the monk answered. But the Bedouin servants had something different to say. Later he met a scientist in Jerusalem, Dr. Bodenheimer, and for the first time tasted 'manna.' 'Having removed the cork, he allowed two or three crystals of manna to fall into my palm. I lifted them to my mouth, and closed my eyes, that I might the better savour them. It was sweet, honey-sweet, but I thought I detected in it the faintest flavour of liquorice.'

Dr. Bodenheimer's account of its origin agreed with that of the Bedouin servants, though differently expressed. 'He has observed and photographed the *Trabutina mannipara* in the act of actually excreting the manna-substance, in beads that vary between pinhead-size and the size of peas. Where there were no insects, he found there was no manna. He discovered later that another insect of the same group, the *Najococcus serpentinus minor*, also ejected the stuff. On their issue, the beads of manna were as transparent as glass and of the consistency of hard syrup. In a few days they crystal-

lized and became in colour anything between milk-white and yellow-brown.'¹

Dr. W. Foxley Norris.

A touching story of the late Dean of Westminster is given in the *Record*. Mr. W. E. Hurcomb writes :

The late Dean of Westminster I knew before he came to Westminster, and in volume ii. of *My Life and Diary* is recorded : 'Some years ago, in a very poor home in Barnsley, there was a lad who was very ill and continually in great pain ; the case was so bad that the doctor went every morning early, about 7.30, to see him.

'One morning the doctor, out on his errand, met the rector going to the station. The two walked on a little way and the doctor happened to mention the sad case he was going to see. They parted—the rector went on to catch his train and the other, soon immersed in the business of the day, thought no more about the chance meeting. The next morning, about seven o'clock, there was a knock at the door of the little house where the boy lived. The mother opened it and saw an unknown gentleman in black clothes, who asked to see the patient, as if he were another doctor. He went upstairs and sat down, and talked to the boy about all manner of interesting things that were going on in the world outside. "I'll draw you one thing I saw," he said, and, taking a card from his pocket he hastily sketched a picture of two dogs fighting. The sick boy watched the picture grow. "But who are you?" he asked in amazement. "I am your neighbour," was the smiling reply. The next minute the strange visitor was gone, and when the doctor arrived the boy showed him the card in great delight. "Look at what my neighbour has done for me," he said.

'Every morning the doctor found that this mysterious visitor had called before he arrived, and cheered the boy with his talk and his pencil. The patient had always another picture to show him. A man on a runaway bicycle, two people talking ; simple, quick drawings of some amusing incident. The mother began to pin them up on the bedroom wall—the jolliest picture gallery imaginable. When the dark hours of the night tortured the sleepless, suffering lad, he looked forward to the morning, when his beloved visitor would call. The rector never failed him. More than once the lad asked him who he was, and always was given that friendly reply, "I am your neighbour." The doctor, of course, found out, but he kept the rector's secret. These two men fought the demon

of pain in that poverty-stricken home until the boy passed on to the dawn of an eternal day. We do not know the doctor's name, but we do know the rector's—he was a rector at Barnsley and became in 1925 Dean of Westminster.'

Carried by Many Prayers.

In the issue of *The British Weekly* for September 30, part of a fine letter, recently written by Pastor Niemöller, the Vicar of Dahlem, from his cell in the Moabit Prison in Berlin, is given. The letter ends with the following words : 'I would like to tell you that I am not only unbroken after six weeks of imprisonment, but am full of joy and gratitude for God's gracious guidance. . . . It is one of our Lord's unfathomable truths that His trust upholds our peace of mind in all situations of life. It really seems as though nothing at all had happened, precisely because everything has happened, everything that had to happen everywhere.

I am now resting in peace after the abundant turmoil of the last few years and am waiting, patient and full of confidence, if the Lord will again need me for service outside these walls. When and how? It is not for me to worry . . . I know that I and many others whom God has committed to solitary places are carried by many prayers. Remember me to . . .'

Future Life.

In his recent volume of reminiscences—*Moments of Memory*—the Hon. Herbert Asquith writes concerning his father and the question of a future life : 'I rarely heard him discuss a problem of philosophy. During these later years I remember one occasion when the conversation suddenly turned to the subject of psychic research, and the value of the evidence it had supplied on the question of the survival of the soul. He seemed to listen with interest, but he did not take much part in the discussion, and at the end of it he suddenly lifted his head and said that he thought we were 'not meant to know' what happened on the other side of death.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

¹ Louis Golding, *In the Steps of Moses the Lawgiver*, 230.